

# **Vinko Pribojević and the Glory of the Slavs**

By

Domagoj Madunić

Submitted to  
Central European University  
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

Advisor: Professor László Kontler

Second Reader: Professor István György Tóth

Budapest, Hungary

2003

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

### Abstract

In the year 1525 on the Island of Hvar in front of a selected audience, the social and intellectual elite of this prosperous Adriatic community, the learned Dominican monk Vinko Pribojević (*Vincentius Priboevius*) gave an oration titled *De Origine Successibusque Slavorum*. With a wide stroke of the brush, Pribojević painted his history of the Slavs from times immemorial to the present day, incorporating in it the histories of various ancient peoples, such as the Thracians, Macedonians, Goths, Gets, Vandals, Sarmatians, Gepids and Illyrians, all of whom he declared Slavs.

Pribojević ignored the migration of the Slavs to the Balkan peninsula in the sixth century, and claimed ethnic continuity for the Slavs in these regions. By doing so, he invents an ancient tradition for contemporary Slavic Dalmatia, linking it with the heritage of the ancient Illyrians. In the case of such an *invented tradition*, one can easily note the obvious connection between the claim of a glorious history, and the author's (in this case Pribojević) ability to identify a particular historical person (Emperor Diocletian, Aristotle, St. Jerome etc.) or entire nations such as Goths, Macedonians or Vandals as alid members of a communal past. The mechanism used for distinguishing the ancestors from the others, contains the core elements that constitutes an understanding of itself and its community. For this purpose, Pribojević used the criteria applied since the early Middle Ages, to distinguish various ethnic groups, namely descent, language and customs.

This study uses Pribojević's oration as a case study in the research of early modern *protonationalism*. The aim is, through the use of an ethno-symbolic framework analyse Pribojević's understanding of collective identity, to show it as a new model of Dalmatian patriotism, one consciously built on the Slavic character of 16<sup>th</sup> century Dalmatia. Furthermore, the study will suggest that unlike the works from the later period known as "Slovinstvo," which placed an emphasis on the special relationship between South Slavs – Illyrians, Pribojević's narrative operated on two different levels, a Dalamtian and pan-Slavic. There is no special notion of unity or relationship to the other south Slavs. To the author of *Oratio Croatia*, Bosnia and Serbia were of equal importance as *Moscovia*, *Cassubia* or *Bohemia*.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Introduction.....	5
1. Presentation of the case.....	5
2. The Author: Vinko Pribojević (Priboevius Vincentius).....	6
3. Theoretical Considerations.....	9
4. Thesis Statement.....	13
Chapter I: Dalmatia: World of Reality.....	14
1. Dalmatia as the Possession of the Republic of St. Mark.....	14
2. Facing the Turkish Tide.....	17
3. Humanism and Renaissance.....	18
4. Beyond the Horizon.....	24
Chapter II: Oratio de origine successibusque Slavorum.....	27
1. The Oration in the Context of its Contemporary Discursive Practices .....	27
2. Myth as the Axis of Pribojević's Oratio.....	28
3. The Glory of the Slavs – Pribojević's Pan-Slavic version of the history.....	41
Chapter III: Illyria the World of Myth.....	43
1. Proto-national elements in Pribojević's oration.....	43
2. Pribojević's Concept of Collective Identity or What Makes Slavs Slavs?.....	44
2. Dalmatian, Illyrian or a Slav?.....	50
3. Appendix to the Myth of Origin.....	56
4. Locating Patria.....	57
5. Sense of Solidarity and the Emergence of Pan-Slavism.....	59
5. Conclusion.....	62
1. Instead of Conclusion: the Role of the Past and How to Connect it to the Present .....	62
Bibliography.....	65
Primary sources:.....	65
Secondary Literature.....	66

## Introduction

The people who once over the soil crawled, now over the stars tread.  
Under your guidance, o fluent language of a learned man,<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Presentation of the Case

#### 1.1. Glory of the Slavs

In the year 1525 on the Island of Hvar in front of a selected audience, the social and intellectual elite of this prosperous Adriatic community, the learned Dominican monk Vinko Pribojević (*Vincentius Priboevius*) gave an oration titled *De Origine Successibusque Slavorum*. With a wide stroke of the brush, Pribojević painted his history of the Slavs from times immemorial to the present day, incorporating in it the histories of various ancient peoples, such as the Thracians, Macedonians, Goths, Gets, Vandals, Sarmatians, Gepids and Illyrians, all of whom he declared to be Slavs.

Pribojević began from the same starting point as other scholars before him,<sup>2</sup> but the conclusions he reached were quite different. Unlike his predecessors, who called the people of the territory between the Danube and Adriatic, Illyrians in the humanistic fashion of the time without actually claiming that they were indeed descendants of the ancient Illyrians, Pribojević's main premise was that the ancient Illyrians and the Slavs, inhabiting the Balkan peninsula of his time, were one and the same people. From this archimedian point, he moves back, to the biblical origins of Slavs, and forward, to the idea of Dalmatia as a part of a large Slavic family of *nationes* ruling in a land that covered more than one half of Europe. This myth of Illyrian origin is the axis on which Pribojević built his entire narrative, and constructed a glorious history of the Slavs.

#### 1.2. From the Oration to the printed book

Although Pribojević's "patriotism," was quite far from politics, far from being a political program and targeted only to a very narrow circle of Dalmatian intellectual elite, his narrative was written with intention to mobilize and inspire. And so it did, it did awaken passion, it provoked a response and became part of Dalmatian historiographical tradition.

As a result of its positive reception, the oration enriched with praises and poems dedicated to the author by various members of the Dalmatian humanist circle, was published twice, both times in Venice. The first edition of the book appeared in 1532,

---

1 Quaeque prius repebat humi, gens sydera calcat  
Vindice te, o docti lingua disertia uiri, ...

From the song of Dominic of Rab dedicated to Vinko Pribojević. Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i Slavi Slavena (On the Origins and the Glory of the Slavs)* (Zagreb: Golden Marketing, 1997) p. 104. (henceforth Pribojević, 1997)

2 For more information see Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, "Tradicija o našim krajevima u antičkom razdoblju kod dalmatinskih pisaca XVI i XVII stoljeća" (Tradition of Our Regions in Antiquity in Works of Dalmatian Writers of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century), *Živa antika*, no. 34 (1984): pp.155-164. (henceforth Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, *Tradicija*)

and the second in 1595, this time translated in Italian. In its final form, the book consisted of five components, the first one is praise (*Economium*) of Vinko Pribojević by Thomae Niger Bishop of Skradin and Trogir and distinguished Dalmatian humanist. The second is Pribojević's introduction, and the dedication to his friend Petar Vitaljić *patritio Pharensi*. The introduction is followed by a letter from Sigismund Đurđević (*Sigismundus Philochristus de Gorgiata*) to the Ragusan Archbishop *Philippo Triulcio* (1521-1543) in which he informs the latter about an interesting document he had found, a "Privilege" of Alexander the Great to the Slavs, followed by a Latin translation of the privilege from Greek, "word by word."<sup>3</sup> The fourth component is Pribojević *Oratio* itself. Finally the last page contains two poems. The first is composed in four verses, *tetrasticon*, by Leonardi Ales and second one by Nikola Dominis of Rab (*Nicolai Dominei Arbensis*), both dedicated to Vinko Pribojević.

The next reprint of Pribojević's *Oratio* appeared in a work named "*Consultatio de principatu inter provincias Europae. Opera et studio Thomae Lansii. Ed. novissima. Acc. hac editione De Suecorum, Slavorum, Dalmatarum et Batavorum regionibus, successibus et virtutibus dissertationes*" by Fredericus Achilles, Duke of Wurtemberg. On the pages 711-756, as an appendix Pribojević's entire *Oratio* was included, but under the title *VINCENTII PRIBOEVII ORATIO De origine, successu & virtute SLAVORUM, CROATARUM, DALMATARUM ET ILLYRIORUM*. The book was published in Amsterdam by *Ioannem Ianssonium* in 1636 and again in 1637.

In the years to come, not all components of his narrative held the same interest for its later readers. His praise of Dalmatia and Hvar which actually constituted two-thirds of the book, brought him much less fame than his new image of the Slavs. Thus it was this set of core ideas: the concept of autochtony of the Slavs on Balkan peninsula, and consequently their identification with ancient Illyrians together with the idea of belonging to a wider Slavic world that proved to be the most resilient parts of Pribojević's narration. They were taken over and further developed by the next generations of historians. So it came about that his ideas had a life of their own, lasting long after Pribojević's oration was lost and forgotten. They spread to the north and south, and were built into the foundations of Croatian supranational ideologies of Slovinstvo and Illyrism.

## **2. The Author: Vinko Pribojević (Priboevius Vincentius)**

As much as a Dalmatian owes to St. Jerome, the same he owes to you  
Vincent, bright star of the Hvar soil.

He is the pride, and you are the glory of our people,  
whom with every right you place above the others.

Countless are the languages and customs of old he knew,  
ancient are the deeds of our kind foretell by you.

---

3 The privilege, originally written in Greek, was allegedly found in Constantinople archive. According to it Alexander knowing that he is about to die in return for their faithful services leaves vast territories to the Slavs. The origin of this privilege is still debatable, whether it is invented around 13<sup>th</sup> century among northern Slavs, Czech's or Poles, or in the south among the South Slavs. For more see Morović, Hrvoje. "Legenda o povelji Aleksandra Velikoga u korist Slavena" (Legend about privilege of Alexander the Great to the Slavs), in *Sa stranica starih knjiga* (Split: Matica Hrvatska, 1968) pp. 109-124.

He teach us about the Christ, you about the Slavs, ...

(Economium by Thomae Nigro Bishop of Skradin and Trogir in honor of Vincent.)<sup>4</sup>

## 2.1. Life of Vinko Pribojević

Up to the present times, the figure of Vinko Pribojević remains one surrounded by a veil of mystery. In 1951 when the first critical edition of Pribojević's oration was published, Grga Novak in its introduction noted "About Pribojević we know very little, and what we do know is based on what he himself said."<sup>5</sup> Even today, our knowledge is not much greater. Some gaps have been filled, mainly based on the research of Joško Kovač,<sup>6</sup> and Stjepan Krasić's publishing of the *Regesta* of letters sent to Croatia by a General of the Dominican Order,<sup>7</sup> but still huge gaps remain.

Vinko Pribojević (Vincentius Priboevius) was born in Dalmatia on the island of Hvar,<sup>8</sup> but the exact date of his birth is unknown. The first record of Vinko Pribojević is from year 1511 when, *Frater Vincentius Dalmata* was appointed *magister studentium* in the Dominican covenant of *Sancatae Mariae Novellae* in Florence.<sup>9</sup> Since he should be around 30 years old at the time of this appointment, one can assume that he was born around 1480. In August of the same year, Pribojević was appointed as the lecturer of the *biblicum* in the same institution. By 1515<sup>10</sup> he earned

---

4 Quantum Hieronymo, tantum tibi Dalmata debet,  
Vincenti, Pharii stella sarena soli.  
Ille decus nostrum, nostrae tu gloria gentis,  
Quam merito cunctis gentibus anteferas.  
Hic calet innumeras linguas moresque ustusos,  
Tu nostri generis gesta uetusta canis.  
Ille docet Christi, populi tu dogma Slavi,  
Pribojević, 1997. p.47.

5 Novak, Grga. "Dalmacija i Hvar u pribojevićevo doba" (Dalmatia and Hvar In the Time of Vinko Pribojević), in *Govor fra Vinka Pribojevića* ( Zagreb: Jugoslavenksa akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951 ) p.6. (Henceforth Grga Novak, 1951)

6 Joško Kovač, "O podrijetlu Vicka Pribojevića" (Concerning the Origin of Vicko Pribojević), *Croatica Chrisitana Periodica*, no. 45 (2000): pp. 207-211.

7 In addition to Pribojević's *Oratio*, *Regeste* are the main source of direct information about Vinko Pribojević. These *regestae* contain 10 mentions of Vincentius from Hvar, of those 12 letters Krasić has associated only the first three with the author of the Oration (*Regesta* 1071, 1099 and 1117). Krasić identified two other Vincentius de Lessina, first he associated with the *regestae* under numbers 1332, 1360, 1594 and 1598, and the second one associated with regesta under numbers 1717, 1760, 1830. The second one can be easily ruled out because regesta 1717 from year 1585 mentions *frater Vincentius de Lessina* as a student at Padua University. But the first Vincentius, argues Joško Kovač, is most probably the same person as the author of the *Oratio*. I have found Kovač claim to be a plausible one, and in this biography of Vinko Pribojević have been relying on information from the four regesta's associated with this Vincentius. See Stjepan Krasić, "Regesti pisama generala dominikanskog reda poslanih u Hrvatsku" (Regesta of Letters Sent to Croatia by Generals of the Dominican Order) (1392-1600), *Arhivski vjesnik*, vols. 22-23 (1978-9): pp. 220-321. (henceforth Stjepan Krasić, *Regesti*); and Joško Kovač, p. 209. footnote 19.

8 The exact place of Pribijević birth is still matter of a dispute. Grga Novak, based on Pribojević's own words (Pribojević called himself Pharius, Pharensis) claimed that Pribojević was born in the town of Hvar itself. Recent research by Joško Kovač in the Hvar historical archive, led him to dispute Novak's statement and to argue that the village of Vrboska in the center of the island was the most probable place of Pribojević's birth. Joško Kovač, pp. 207-209.

9 Stjepan Krasić, *Regesti*, p. 217.

10 Stjepan Krasić, *Generalno učilište dominikanskog reda u Zadru ili "Univeristas Jadertina"* (1396-

the title of *Magisterii Sacrae Theologiae*.<sup>11</sup> These are the only confirmed facts regarding the course of his education, concerning everything else only assumptions are possible. Grga Novak assumes that as a young man, he attended the monastery school at Hvar, Stjepan Krasić in his work concerning the Zadar Dominican University<sup>12</sup> argues that Pribojević studied there, and earned the title of *lector* in that institution before his appointment in Florence.

What happened to Pribojević between 1511 and 1521 is unknown. But in 1521, he was again in Dalmatia, together with Dominic Buća from Kotor (*fratri Dominico Buchia*) he has been sent to Senj (Segnia), in order to investigate the case of a local prior Juraj Belčanić from Zadar (*Georgium Belchanich Jadertinum*)<sup>13</sup>. In 1525 he was again on Hvar, his home island, where he gave his *Oratio* in the church of St. Marco in the town of Hvar. After that, there is no trace of Pribojević in the sources, until November 1545 when he wrote his last will,<sup>14</sup> and 1546 when he joined the Lombardian province.<sup>15</sup> The year 1555 holds the last known information concerning Pribojević, he was allowed to join the monastery of St. Dominic in Ancona.<sup>16</sup>

Other information concerning Pribojević are those provided by himself in his *Oratio*. Thus we know that, before 1525 he visited Poland and spent three years there.<sup>17</sup> Neither the purpose of his visit nor the exact years are known. In his work Pribojević refers to the *Tractatus de duobus Sarmatiis* by Maciej Miechowita, published in 1517, this leaves two options for his stay in Poland: either the period from 1517 -1521 or the one between 1521 – 1525.

The *Oratio* also provides information about two of his relatives: first his brother, Jeronim Pribojević (*Hieronymus Priboevius*),<sup>18</sup> also a member of the Dominican order, and second his cousin Petar Blažić (*Petrus Blausius*).<sup>19</sup>

This sums up our knowledge of the author of the *Oratio De Origine Successibusque Slavorum*. Born in the Dalmatia on Island of Hvar, magister of theology, lecturer in Florence and visitor to Poland. The Latin language and list of sources used in his

1807) (General University of Dominican Order in Zadar or "Universitas Jadertina") (Split: Sveučilište u Splitu, 1996) p. 606. (henceforth Stjepan Krasić, *Generalno učilište*)

11 For the overview of the education system of the Dominican Order see Stjepan Krasić, *Generalno učilište*, pp. 155-198, 353-382, 383-434, 469-546.

12 Ibid., p. 606.

13 Stjepan Krasić, *Regesti*, p. 219.

14 Ibid., 1979. p. 240.

15 Ibid., 1979. p. 243.

16 Ibid., 1979. p. 270.

17 Pribojević, 1997. p.70.

18 Pribojević lists his name among other educated people of his homeland. Apart from that, concerning his brother Jeronim very little is known, only that he was allowed to make his last will in 1563. Pribojević, 1997. p.81; Stjepan Krasić, *Regesti*, p.273.

19 The records about his other relative, cousin Petrus Blausius (Petar Blažić) are more picturesque. Pribojević mentions an anecdote that happened to Blasius, captain of the merchant ship, on his way to England. When passing by the North African coast Peter was informed that some Spanish pirate (*pirata Hispano*) was besieging the harbor of *Carthagera* and so endangering three Venetian ships. This provoked "such an anger in Peter", that he disregarding all unfavorable conditions: enemy was more numerous, their ship was bigger and Peter himself was troubled by fever, immediately attacked the enemy. And, since in stories like this, where the brave and courageous are in grace of *fortuna*, wind was very favorable to Peter's ship, and he attacked pirates with such ferocity that after a long battle, their ship was burned and all pirates captured or killed, with only few losses in Peter's crew. Pribojević, 1997. p.101.



work reveals a highly educated humanist, one familiar with both the classical authors (he uses 39 authors from Antiquity) and the Renaissance. Among his sources are such distinguished humanist names as Erasmus of Rotterdam, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, Antonio Sabellico, Flavio Biondo, Maciej Miechowita, Hartmman Schedell, and Werner Rolevnick.

### **3. Theoretical Considerations**

The theoretical problems connected to the research of Pribojević's *De Origine*, leads to two more general problems, the use of historiographical works as historical evidence, and the problem of researching collective identities in early modern period. Or to rephrase the two above questions into one that best suits the framework of this paper: how can the works of historiography be used as a sources for investigation in the field of collective identities, particularly the works of Renaissance historiography?

#### **3.1. Historiographical Works and Research on Collective Identity**

For historians dealing with the history of collective identities in early modern Europe, it is practical and convenient as Timothy Hampton argues to distinguish between two major lines of investigation. The first is the history of the centralizing processes of the "state" – state building which transforms traditional communities by imposing on them new forms of power and organization. The second is the "history of the set of images, myths, and practices shared by those born in the same community or region."<sup>20</sup>

Renaissance historiography "fused enthusiasm for ancient models with pride in the contemporary *patria*, *city-state*."<sup>21</sup> This 'local-patriotism' of fifteenth century Italian humanists, such as Bruni, Guiccardini and Sabellico, was subsequently in the works of their French, German, English and other non-Italian counterparts successfully widened to cover a national scale. In the works of writers who as Pribojević concentrated on the history of single *patria* (whether it be a city-state, nation, or still broader region), one can locate two main intentions: to awaken patriotism and to propagate a particular set of moral,<sup>22</sup> political or religious values that the author of the work in question finds fundamental for his communal identity. The first is closely connected to some territory or polity, but the role of the former is to set the limit, define the edge of the community and to distinguish it from other neighboring groups. This feature of historiographical works as a carriers of community representation of itself makes them fruitful and plausible sources, especially for the

---

<sup>20</sup> Timothy Hampton, *Literature and the nation in the Sixteenth Century. Inventing Renaissance France* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2001) pp. 11 -12.

<sup>21</sup> Ernest Breisach, *Historiography Ancient, Medieval and Modern* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994) p.154.

<sup>22</sup> In the spirit of the time, it would be highly desirable if such claims could have the backing in the works of ancient authors. As for example was the cases with German Renaissance historians who in their works put emphasis on the valors of their ancestors found in Tacitus *Germania*, or with the French who pointed out at the extraordinary character of Gauls in the Caesar's *Commentaries*. John Hale, *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance* (London: Fontana Press, 1994) p. 29-30.

second line of investigation, that concentrates on the history of myths, customs and traditions. Furthermore, taking into account the mythical nature of Pribojević's content, his work qualifies as an excellent source for this kind of research.

Another interesting feature of Pribojević's narrative is its break with the historical tradition of medieval Dalmatian historiography. Unlike his medieval colleagues, he ignored the great migration of the Slavs to the Balkan peninsula in the sixth century, and claimed continuity and invented an ancient tradition for his contemporary Slavic Dalmatia. In the case of such an *invented tradition*, one can easily note the obvious connection between the claim of a glorious history, and the author's (in this case Pribojević) ability to identify a particular historical person (Emperor Diocletian, Aristotle, St. Jerome etc.) or entire nations such as the Goths, Macedonians or Vandals as valid members of a communal past. The mechanism used for distinguishing one's ancestors from those of the others, also contains the core elements that constitute an understanding of itself and one's community. For this purpose, namely to distinguish various ethnic groups, Pribojević used a set of criteria known and applied already from the early Middle Ages: descent, language and customs.<sup>23</sup>

Before proceeding further with the question of the theoretical model that should be used when dealing with concept such as collective identity, it would be useful to give a short overview of the current state of the debates in the study of nationalism.

### **3.2. Summary of Debates in the Study of Nationalism**

According to their basic epistemological positions, theories of nations and nationalism are usually classified into four major theoretical groups: primordialist, perennialist, modernist and ethno-symbolist. What follows is a short presentation of each of those paradigms.

The assumptions that nations as divisions of humanity are natural and primordial, and that nationalism was universal, served as a foundation of the primordial paradigm. The basis for this division were found in the rootedness of nation in kinship, ethnicity and genetic attributes of humanity.<sup>24</sup> There are three variants of primordialism: popular, biological and cultural variant.

The oldest understanding of a nation and nationalism, one formulated by early nationalists, was that of the nation as a natural organism, they may be forgotten and dormant but are present even in the state of nature, waiting to be awakened and reborn again. Another variant of primordialism arouses from recent attempt of sociobiologists to explain ethnic communities as extensions of the family or kinship units. The most prominent representative of this theory, P. Van den Berghe, argues for the biological character of nations, claiming that it is possible to trace the descent of their members to the same genetic pool.

Finally, the third variant, the so-called "cultural primordialism" put forward by

<sup>23</sup> For more information concerning the use and development of this criterion in the Middle Ages see Walter Pohl, "Telling the Difference: Signs of Ethnic Identity," in *Strategies of Distinction. The Constitution of Ethnic Communities, 300-800*. eds. Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998) pp. 17-71. (henceforth Walter Pohl, *Telling the Difference*)

<sup>24</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) pp. 3-4.

Clifford Geertz and Edward Shils turns its attentions to the role of 'participants' in community membership. Both authors argue that a primordial tie, found at the bottom of the nation, is based on emotions and affection, that "It was and is the members of ethnic communities and nations who feel their communities are primordial."<sup>25</sup>

On the other hand, the position advocated by supporters of the perennialist line, is that nations have existed throughout human history as collective actors, but not as a part of the natural order, and should not be understood as *primordial* or natural phenomena. The most prominent figures of this paradigm J.R. Leober and A. Hastings claim that nations are historical entities, with uninterrupted existence so some modern nations could be considered direct descendants of their medieval or even ancient counterparts. Thus, the history of humanity can be seen as a record of conflict and interaction among various nations. Moreover, according to the perennialist understanding, the nations represent a recurrent historical phenomena, they can emerge at one time and be dissolve at another, and then reappear in some other space and time.

The basic assumption, common to primordialists and perennialists, that of the longevity and antiquity of nations, is strongly rejected by modernists. For modernists, nations and nationalism are of recent origins, they are products of the last two centuries of historical developments, namely that of the process of modernisation. This basic concept of the modernist paradigm nevertheless functions only as an umbrella, under which various different theories and models of nation formation and nationalism are grouped together. Concerning the type of the process which leads to the emergence of the nation, it is possible to distinguish three main streams within the modernist paradigm.

The 'socio-economic' version of modernism, deeply influenced by Wallerstein's center-periphery model of economic development, argues that nations and nationalism are products of uneven development of western European countries and the rest of the world. Tom Nairn and Michael Hechter, prominent advocates of the socio-economic approach, consider nationalism as the price paid for the quick implementation of capitalism.

Another variant of this model put forth by Ernest Gellner, is the so-called socio-cultural modernism. Gellner, similar to other modernists, sees the nation as a purely modern phenomenon but attributes its emergence to social and cultural aspects of modernisation instead of only economics. For Gellner, the key event is the process of transformation of traditional societies and culture, under pressure of the modern state, by means of a standardized education system and industrial development, into a homogeneous community built on a single state-supported national culture.

The third variant of modernism approaches nationalism from the instrumentalist standpoint, and treats it as a tool used in a political struggle for control of the modern state. John Breuilly argues that nationalism has the exclusive function of coordinating, mobilizing and legitimizing the struggle of a particular sub-elite for political power. Others follow in the lines of Brailly's political functionalist concept of nationalism but with slight modifications, like P. R. Brass who considers a nation as a politicized cultural identity, or like Eric Hobsbawm, for whom nations are products

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., p. 99.

of social engineering, with the function to secure social cohesion.

In the famous work, *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson took a step away from the modernist paradigm. For Anderson, nationalism is a modern cultural artefact, the consequence of the printing revolution and the so-called 'print-capitalism,' created by a nationalist intelligentsia or other affirmative social group and then circulated to others through vernacular literature. The nation is defined as an *imagined community*, whose existence was made possible by previously mentioned means, and which occupied an empty social space – the consequence of the decline of sacred monarchies and religious script communities.

Finally, the departure from the modernist paradigm occurred with the emergence of the ethno-symbolism, which returns to the pre-national collective experiences of the nations. The ethno-symbolist approach to the study of nationalism springs from a critique of the modernist neglect of the symbolist heritage of pre-modern ethnic identities. The basic premise of ethno-symbolists is that the problems of nations should be viewed from the 'longue durée' perspective, with a special focus on the role of ethnicity in the formation of the modern nation. The first one to apply this alternative approach to study of nations was John Armstrong, to be followed by one of the most prominent advocates of ethno-symbolism today, Anthony D. Smith. Expanding the work done by Armstrong, Smith developed a model for the transformation of ethnic communities into a nation. At the core of his theory is concept of ethnicity, or more precisely ethnic community, which Smith defines as a "named human population with myths of common ancestry, shared historical memories and one or more elements of culture, including an association with a homeland, and some degree of solidarity, at least among the elites."<sup>26</sup>

What makes the ethno-symbolist framework interesting in researching collective identities in European early modern history is its concentration on myths, memories, traditions and symbols of ethnic heritage.

As previously mentioned, the most resilient parts of *Oratio*, those that endured the test of time, were mythical in nature. Moreover the axis of the entire narrative was the myth, that of the Illyrian heritage of South Slavs. All this features of Pribojević's narration point to the ethno-symbolic framework, which places an emphasis on the role of myths in shaping a group identity, as the most suitable model to apply in the investigation of this problem.

### 3.3. Methodological Considerations

From a methodological point of view, this research belongs to the tradition of intellectual history. I found the approach postulated by Dominic LaCapra in his book *Rethinking Intellectual History* very inspiring and applicable. Starting from the text – context discussion, LaCapra develops a thesis that intellectual history should put more attention to what he calls the 'worklike' aspect of the texts, in contrast to the traditional documentary aspect.<sup>27</sup> The documentary approach to the text, situates it in "terms of factual or literal dimensions involving reference to empirical reality and

---

<sup>26</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *Myths and memories*, p.13.

<sup>27</sup> Dominic LaCapra, *Rethinking Intellectual History: texts, contexts, language* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 29-31.

conveying information about it."<sup>28</sup> This single relation between text and its context, which is usually limited only to the socio-historical reality of the text, according to LaCapra should be replaced by a set of interacting contexts. Thus LaCapra argues, that the focus of historical research should be expanded and concentrate on relationships between text and its various contexts.

There are six different contexts that LaCapra singles out as the objects of analysis: the author's intention, the author's life, society, culture, corpus of the writer and the modes of discourse.<sup>29</sup> For LaCapra the historian is expected to analyse these contexts in their relation to the text, but also in their relation to one another.

#### **4. Thesis Statement**

It is my intention to use Pribojević's oration as a case study in the research of early modern *protonationalism*. Following the approach proposed by Dominic LaCapra the interpretive part of the thesis is preceded by a strong contextualisation of the *Oratio*. In the first chapter, "Dalmatia: world of reality" an analysis of the social and cultural contexts strengthened by the political reality of 16<sup>th</sup> century Dalmatia is presented.

The second chapter situates Pribojević's text within the context of his contemporary discursive practices. Accordingly, *De Origine* is placed in relation to both the corpus of Dalmatian and European literature of its time.

Finally the fourth chapter "Illyria: world of myth", has a more interpretive function. The intention is through the use of an ethno-symbolic framework to analyse Pribojević's understanding of collective identity, and to show it as a new model of Dalmatian patriotism, one consciously built on the Slavic character of 16<sup>th</sup> century Dalmatia. Furthermore, unlike the works from later period known as "Slovinstvo," which places an emphasis on the special relationship between South Slavs – Illyrians,<sup>30</sup> Pribojević's narrative operated on two different levels, a Dalmatian and pan-Slavic. There is no special notion of unity or relationship to the other South Slavs. To Hvar Dominican Croatia, Bosnia and Serbia are of equal importance as *Moscovia*, *Cassubia* or *Bohemia*. No matter how glorious the ancient Illyrians were, he does not express any special affection towards contemporary Illyria and its inhabitants, they are just members of a wider Slavic family.

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p.30.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., pp. 36-61.

<sup>30</sup> For more see Đurđev, Branko, Grafenauer Boris, and Tadić Jorjo, eds. *Historija Naroda Jugoslavije* (History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia) (Zagreb: 1959), pp. 245-269.

## Chapter I: Dalmatia: World of Reality

The Croatian writer Miroslav Krleža in his famous essay "Pater Juraj Križanić" suggested that the long and rich history of Croatian supra-national integrative ideologies (*Slovinstvo*, Illyrianism, Yugoslavism) originated from centuries of weakness, of constant battle for survival, from, so to speak, traumas of having a history on the verge of ceasing to exist.<sup>31</sup> Writing his *Oratio* in 1525 Pribojević is living in the transitory period. Dalmatian communes are still enjoying some level of peace and prosperity and the Kingdom of Croatia to the north, although under constant pressure of Ottoman attacks for the last few decades, is still holding. All of which is about to change drastically in the next few decades.

The aim of this chapter is to reconstruct the historical context of Dalmatia in Pribojević's time, addressing especially its political, social and cultural aspects. Naturally, providing a comprehensive overview of Dalmatia at the turn of 15<sup>th</sup> and first decades of the 16<sup>th</sup> century is far beyond the scope of this study. Instead what follows is a sketch, intended to roughly outline the historical perspective of Pribojević's life. This overview is limited both in space and time: in space it is restricted to Dalmatia; in time it is concerned only with the period that immediately precedes Pribojević *Oratio*.

### **1. Dalmatia as the Possession of the Republic of St. Mark**

For the Dalmatian communes the 15<sup>th</sup> century began quite ceremonially, both metaphorically and literally. Metaphorically, because of economic progress, the rise of humanism and communal life, and literally because, for the first time after almost 300 years, a crowning ceremony took place in Zadar. In the Cathedral of St. Anastasia on August 5<sup>th</sup>, 1403, the Archbishop of Esztergom crowned Ladislav of Naples, last of the Angevin line as a King of Hungary, which title also included the title of King of Croatia and Dalmatia. Six years later in 1409 after long negotiations Ladislav sold what little of Dalmatia he still held, together with his rights to the rest, to the Republic of Venice for 100,000 ducats.

Between 1409 and 1420, the *most serene Republic* established its rule over its acquired possession. Some of the Dalmatian communes,<sup>32</sup> wishing to end an ongoing civil war (lasting from 1382), and return to peace, stability, prosperity and communal liberty not breached by northern outsiders (be they representatives of Buda kings or Bosnian magnates in the service of the Naples court), opted for Venice as a solution to those problems. Others, such as Šibenik and Trogir, needed to be subdued by force. Nevertheless, on all town squares from Rab to Kotor (with the exception to the Republic of Ragusa) by the end of 1421 the banner of St. Mark flew.

---

<sup>31</sup> Miroslav Krleža, *Eseji* (Essays) (Zagreb: Naprijed, 1959).

<sup>32</sup> Such was the case with Zara (1409), Cres-Osor (1409), Split (1420), Korčula (1420), Brač (1420) and finally Hvar in 1421. Special was the case of Kotor, which in period from 1396 to 1420, found itself under to strong pressure from its hinterland and asked for Venetian protection for six times. All the requests for protection were denied, until finally during the victorious campaign of 1420, Venice decided to grant the wishes of Kotor, and took it under protection.

Although the Dalmatian communes received the same privileges as other possessions of Venice on the *terraferma*, they soon discovered that they had received more than they bargained for. The days of communal liberty and bargaining with a distant feudal lord were gone, a centralized state and standardized form of government were the symptoms of the new age.

At the head of the new administration of each Dalmatian commune was a Count (*Conte*), a Venetian noble elected not by the commune, but rather sent from Venice. Although the establishment of these new bodies did not abolish the old communal institutions, they limited their jurisdiction and influence. Venice found its power basis in the constant social tensions between the commoners and nobility, the conflict that (*serenissima* sometimes encouraged herself<sup>33</sup>) enabled it to play the role of unbiased and fair ruler. From the beginning Venice granted full citizenship to nobles and commoners alike. In legal matters all of their subjects were equal before the law, but Venice refused further requests from commoners to abolish the nobility entirely. Legal reforms were not followed by a change in the social order. Thus legal egalitarianism was the main strength of the Venetian rule but also its main weakness. The government relied on the support of commoners, but conducted its rule with the help of dissatisfied nobles of whom many often looked to the north, to their former kingdom, Hungary-Croatia. By granting full citizenship, Venice did not make Dalmatians equal *citizens* but rather equal *subjects* of the most serene republic.

Nevertheless, the protection of the winged lion brought peace and a return of economic prosperity in the first decades, although the economic system of Dalmatian communes was restructured, and was centered solely on Venice.<sup>34</sup> This political separation of coastal cities from their natural economic environment proved unfavorable for some communes such as Šibenik and Split, whose trade was based on the hinterland, and prosperous for others, such as Hvar, which stand on the major Adriatic trade lines.

Throughout the Middle Ages Venice tried several times to put Hvar under its control. The first time the island of Hvar came under the Venetian government was in 1000, during the victorious campaign of Doge Peter II Orseolo, when almost all Dalmatia recognized the rule of Venice.<sup>35</sup> The next time Venice came into possession of the island was in 1278, when the commune surrendered itself. In 1292 Venice began construction of an arsenal for storing food and other supplies, with the intention of turning Hvar into a major naval base. In 1358 Venice lost it together with the rest of Dalmatia, only to regain it again in 1421.

---

33 An excellent example of such practices is the commune of Hvar, with its decades long conflict between the commoners and nobility. In 1440 Venetian government decided that in the case of dispute, the commoners same as patricians can come to Venice on communal expenses. For more see Grga Novak, *Hvar* (Beograd: 1924) pp. 80-113.

34 The goal of Venice was to cut, or at least to downgrade the trade links of Dalmatian communes with the Italian coast, and to concentrate the traffic of all goods toward herself. Achievement of this result was not product of legal bans or various regulations, but rather of economic strength of the Venice itself and its role as the metropolis of the Adriatic. See Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje* (Croatian Middle Ages) (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1997) pp. 432-436.

35 This is one of the rare events from the Middle Ages that Pribojević mentions in his narrative. He is putting it wrongly in year 987, and enrich the story with allegedly fierce resistance of Hvarans and subsequent razing of their town, an event that actually never took place. Pribojević, 1997. p. 99.

In the 15<sup>th</sup> century, Hvar experienced rapid economic growth, followed by an increase in the population and the development of urban life. In Pribojević's time, Hvar was the richest of the Dalmatian communes. Her incomes amounted to 4,000 ducats, which was more than enough to cover communal expenses, and even to have some surplus for presents to the Captain of the Gulf, and various other Venetian dignitaries.

In his *Oratio*, Pribojević left a beautiful description<sup>36</sup> of his home island; about the town of Hvar, its churches, monasteries, palaces and its harbor. Although in his narrative, Pribojević is sometimes too fond of overstatement, as when claiming 700 stone houses in the suburbs Hvar, or that the houses in the surrounding villages resemble those in the town itself,<sup>37</sup> his description reveals a self-conscious citizen, proud of the urban achievements of his commune (which he *accidentally* styles as a Republic<sup>38</sup>). He especially stresses the economic progress his commune enjoyed, thanks to Hvar's excellent geographic position in the Venetian economic system, because: "wish it or not, all that sail through the Illyrian Sea, carrying goods, must harbour in it."<sup>39</sup>

For whatever produces rich Orient, whatever gives fertile Latium, whatever offers bold Illyria, whatever beget sunny Africa, whatever carry rough Hispania, whatever offers for exchange wild Scythia, whatever brings forth happy Arabia, whatever export verbose Greece, is frequently sold in this town.<sup>40</sup>

... Many times I have seen how this harbor, in the sunrise was without the ships, but at the sunset I have counted twenty or thirty vessels."<sup>41</sup>

This tranquil image of the city harbor at sunset, in the year 1525, is one in sharp contrast with the sight seen in the same place only 11 years prior. Villages in flame, Venetian war galleys anchored in the harbor and twenty four bodies hanging from the yardmast of Sebastiano Giustinian's flagship. This is how, after almost four years in October 1514, the greatest social disorder Dalmatia experienced until the 19<sup>th</sup> century ended, the event known in history as the Hvar commoners insurrection of 1510.<sup>42</sup> At the time, social tensions on the Island of Hvar have reached a breaking point and in May 1510, a bloody conflict between commoners and nobles broke out. Many nobles were slaughtered, their houses pillaged and razed, and the rest were saved only by flight. Soon, the unrest spread to other Dalmatian cities, nobles were also driven out from Šibenik and riots broke out in Split and Zadar. Nevertheless, the insurrection soon died out, everywhere except on Hvar, where it had to be put down by military force. The leaders of the revolt were executed and many more were sent to the galleys or physically punished.

Most probably Pribojević did not witness these events as he was in Florence in July 1511, but the memory of it certainly remained strong among the inhabitants of Hvar

---

36 Pribojević, 1997, pp. 92-94.

37 For more see Joško Kovač, p. 209.; Pribojević, 1997, p.92.

38 Pribojević, 1997, p. 99.

39 Ibid., p. 94.

40 Nam quicquid diues producit oriens, quicquid pingue parturit Latium, quicquid ferox gignit Illyria, quicquid aprica generat Africa, quicquid aspera affert Hispania, quicquid horrida permutat Scythia, quicquid felix prodit Arabia, quicquid uerbosa educit Graecia, frequenti hac urbe est successione uenale. Ibid., pp. 94-95.

41 Ibid., p. 95.

42 Grga Novak, 1951. p. 14.



for a long time. On several places the careful Dominican offers a series of well hidden allusions concerning this unfortunate event.<sup>43</sup>

## **2. Facing the Turkish Tide**

In 1414, at the peak of the struggle between Sigismund, the Naples party, the Bosnian King and various Bosnian and Croatian magnates, all with their own agendas concerning this conflict, a new power almost unnoticed entered the arena. The defeated Bosnian magnate Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić, invited the Turks as his allies to Bosnia. In 1415, the first Turkish raid in Dalmatia occurred, this was soon followed by one in Slavonia. Although only on limited scale, these raids were a clear sign of the gloomy times that were to come.

The defeats at Varna in 1444 and at "Kosovo polje" in 1448 put an end to the offensive efforts of the Hungarian kings to expel the Turks from Europe. After the conquest of Constantinople, the Turkish offensive regained momentum: in 1459 the Serbian despotate collapsed, and in 1463 Bosnia was overrun and the road lay open to Croatia and Dalmatia. The days of the offensive were over, and the epoch of defense and fortifications began. King Matthias, driven by his ambitions in the west, abandoned the offensive attitude of his predecessors and set up a defensive system of two Banats (Jajce and Srebrenica) in the recovered part of Bosnia. The effect of these measures was not long lasting, Srebrenica fell in 1512, and Jajce in 1528.

The fall of Bosnia in 1463 suddenly brought the Turks into the neighborhood of the Dalmatian communes, separated from them by Hercegovina and parts of Croatia south of the Velebit Mountains. From 1463 to 1479, Venice was engaged in war against the Turks, because of her Levantine possessions. The geo-strategic reasons of the *Signoria* made Dalmatia a secondary theatre of war, one left on her own to defend against an overwhelming enemy.

Starting from 1468, Dalmatia was under constant attack by the Turkish irregular troops. The devastating tactics implemented by these light troops were extremely successful. As a consequence, many inhabitants fled Dalmatia and went to Italy, others moved to the sea, closer to the cities and newly built lines of small fortifications (*Kaštela*), designed to shelter the peasant population from the fast and devastating attacks. Although the peace of 1479 ended Turkish raids and brought a period of relative peace and recovery, it did not stop further Turkish assaults, but just diverted them temporarily to another direction.

The Turkish expansion continued in adjacent lands. In 1482 Hercegovina collapsed and the central parts of Dalmatia were open to Turkish raids. To the north, after the fatal defeat of Croat army at Krbava in 1493, "the first ruin of the Kingdom of Croatia" as the 16<sup>th</sup> century Croatian chronicler Ivan Tomašić called it, the situation got even dimmer. When a new war broke out between Venice and the Turks in 1499, all the horrors of the Turkish raids returned to Dalmatia with full intensity. Although on May 13, 1501 the League of Pope Alexander VI, Venice and the Kingdom of Hungary was declared with the goal of a crusade against the Turks, Venice pursued its own policy of appeasement towards the Ottoman Empire. After having lost Lepanto, Modon and Coron in 1502, Venice fled the fight. During this war, Dalmatia

---

43 Pribojević, 1997, pp. 89-90, 99.

was again left alone as a secondary theater of operations. The first decades of the 16<sup>th</sup> century brought a long awaited period of relative peace to Dalmatia. For a short while the Turkish pressure was turned in another direction.

The Croatian bans of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, first John Corvin and then Petar Berislavić, managed to temporarily stop the Turkish advance in Croatia, but after the latter's death in an ambush at Plješevica in 1520, the defensive system quickly collapsed. To the north, in 1521, Belgrade, the gate to Hungary, was lost. To the south, the situation was also catastrophic, in 1522 the seat of the Croatian kings Knin and the town of Skradin were captured. In the next year, Ostrovica fell, and after a two year siege 1525-27, the strategic fortress of Obrovac was taken by the Turks. Hence, Dalmatia and Croatia lost direct land contact, and were now separated by the territory of the Ottoman Empire.

What was the world of the Dalmatian humanists around 1520 like? Although enjoying relative peace after the end of the 1499-1502 war, the 1520's saw a renewal of Turkish raids in spite of the fact that no open war had been declared. All in all, the sense of living on the periphery could not be avoided, their homeland depopulated and marginalized, pushed to the coast, and witnesses to the constant warfare in the north that cut off its economic background.

### **3. Humanism and Renaissance**

The paradox of sixteenth century Croatia is best described by the following statement of the Croatian historian of literature, Mihovil Kombol: "cultural flourish on the seaside, blood and tears in the hinterland – that is the Croatian 16<sup>th</sup> century."<sup>44</sup>

#### **3.1 The Rise of Humanism**

The first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century in Dalmatia was a period when the foundations were laid for a later period of cultural prosperity. The crucial part of this process was the transformation of the educational system, a move from private education and traditional public schools established during the 14<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>45</sup> to humanistic schools, remodeled according to the new needs and standards of the time. Throughout the century, such schools were founded all across Dalmatia. As the professors (*magistri humanitatis*) for such schools the communes frequently invited (and sometimes even had to compete among themselves) educated Italian humanists. Many of these professors spent several decades in Dalmatia, and left their trace in Croatian Humanism not only as teachers and educators, but also as active writers. Such was the case with Tideo Acciarini, Filippo de Diversis, Marino Becichemo and Palladio Fosco. The case of the last is the most striking: Palladio Fosco, originating from Padua, spent 41 year as a professor in Dalmatia, and left

44 Mihovil Kombol, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti do preporoda* (History of the Croatian literature before the national revival) (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1961) p. 62.

45 Since the 14<sup>th</sup> century throughout all Dalmatia, communes began to establish public schools. For example, such was the case of Ragusa where already from 1333, public school with classes in the basics of Latin grammar and accounting were held by Nicolo of Verona. See Nikica Kolumbić, "Humanistička naobrazba u hrvatskih renesansnih pjesnika (Humanistic education of Croatian Renaissance poets)" in *Dani hvarskog kazališta: Hrvatski humanizam - Ianus Panonius* (Split: književni krug, 1990) pp. 56-71.

behind his ethno-geographical work *Description of the Illyrian Coast*.<sup>46</sup>

For further education, Croatian humanists, whether from Venice-controlled Dalmatia or from the northern Kingdom of Pannonia, mainly turned to Italy, where Padua was one of their most frequent destination. Some time after 1500, the University of Krakow became more and more popular among Croatian humanists.

Apart from these public humanist schools, there were many Church schools within the complex of the monasteries. This was especially the case with the Dominican monasteries, like the monastery of St. Mark on Hvar, one of which Pribović left us testimony. The year 1396 is an important one in the history of education in Dalmatia, since in that year the provincial Dominican school in Zadar was upgraded to the rank of a general Dominican University (*studium generale*).<sup>47</sup> These institutions provided the basis for the birth of Croatian humanism in the last decades of the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

### 3.2. The Main Features of Croatian Humanism

In the 1520's, there were two major centers of activity of the Croatian humanists. The first were in the urban centers of Dalmatia, including the Republic of Ragusa, its brightest star, also called 'the crown of Croat cities'.<sup>48</sup> The second one was the circle of Croat writers around the Buda Royal court. The political division of the Croatian ethnic body into two separate polities in the 15<sup>th</sup> century proved to be of far less consequence than the Ottoman invasion. Although by the time of the Peace of 1433, Dalmatia was practically lost to the Hungarian-Croatia Kingdom, neither Sigismund nor his successors dropped the empty title of King of Dalmatia and continued to style themselves as *rex Croatiae et Dalmatiae*. The links between north and south were never broken, the courts of Sigismund and especially King Matthias and his successors drew many Dalmatian humanists to the north in search of employment.

In the age of King Matthias such was the case of the sculptor Ivan Duknović (Ioannes Dalmata) from Trogir, or the Ragusan Felix Petančić. In King Matthias' time, whose services as a diplomat were also used by the Jagiellons. During the Jagiellonian reign of Ladislav II (1490-1516) and Louis II (1516-1526), this practice even intensified. During 16<sup>th</sup> century, at their court we find Trogirans: Bishop Petar Berislavić (later ban of Croatia) and Ivan Statalić (Johannes Statileo, 1472-1542) a poet and diplomat, and a little later coming from Šibenik Antun Vrančić (Antonius Verantius, 1504-1573) poet, scholar, diplomat and *primas* of Hungary. These humanists, working in the north, served as a living link between the two separated communities.

The responses to the universal call to humanists throughout Europe varied from one region to another. The responses of various communities were shaped by their local specifics, some responded earlier, some later, some found humanist ideas and values in accordance with their cultural traditions and some did not. However, the humanist call for a revival of traditions of Antiquity and Latin literacy found fertile

46 For more on Fosco see Miroslav Kurelac, "Paladije Fusko-Palladius Fuscus, Život i djelo (Paladije Fusko-Palladius Life and Work)" in Fusko, Paladije. *Opis Obale Ilirika* (Description of the Illyrian Coast). tr. Kuntić-Makvić Bruna. (Zagreb: Latina & Graeca, 1990) pp. 5-50.

47 Stjepan Krasić, *Generalno učilište*, pp. 295-313

48 This is how Croatian poet Ivan Vidal from Korčula called it in his epistle: "kruna hrvatskih gradov svih." Marin Franičević, *Povijest hrvatske renesansne književnosti* (History of the Croatian Renaissance Literature) (Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1986) p. 195.

soil in Croatia, and soon the Croatian Renaissance was born.

In Croatian lands, many factors supported the rise of humanism: a high level and long tradition of urban life in the Dalmatian coastal cities, their strong links and proximity to Italy and the orientation of communities towards trade and the sea which brought many of its members into contact with various lands, people and cultures. Furthermore, at the beginning of this analysis one major feature of Croatian humanism must be stressed, and that is its trilingual character: Latin, Croatian and Italian.

The fading of the medieval Latin literary tradition overlapped with the new humanist Latin writing. Hence in the Croatian Renaissance Latin literary creativity represented a continuation of an already rich medieval Latin tradition. The years from 1450's through 1500 were a formative period for the Croatian Renaissance, rich in both the number of authors and quality of their works. In this period Dalmatian Latin literature reached its maturity through the works of Juraj Šižgorić (Georgius Sisgoreus Sibenicensis, ca. 1420-1509),<sup>49</sup> Koriolan Ćipiko (*Coroiolanus Cepio*, 1428-1493),<sup>50</sup> Ilija Crijević (Aelius Lampridius Cervinus, 1463-1520)<sup>51</sup> and Jakov Bunić (Jacobus Bonus, 1469-1534),<sup>52</sup> and continued to play an important role in the Croatian literary tradition. Furthermore, as a consequence of unfavorable historical developments, the Latin language from 18<sup>th</sup> century served as a shield which protected the national language until its full affirmation in 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>53</sup>

Parallel to this was the process of the development of the vernacular literature. Since the Middle Ages, there was a strong literary tradition among the Croats of writing in Slavic vernacular (known as Church Slavonic). Besides writing in two, or even three, languages, several types of alphabet were used as well: Glagolitic, Latin and western Cyrillic (so called *bosančica*). In the 15<sup>th</sup> century, Glagolitic production reached its

---

49 Juraj Šižgorić after completing his education in hometown of Šibenik went to Padua University, and there earned the doctoral degree in Law. Upon returning to Šibenik he became general vicar to the Bishop of Šibenik. He was the first among Dalmatians to publish a collection of poems, *Elegarum et Carminum libri tre* (1477, Venice). Although his opus remained small, it brought him immediate fame in Dalmatia and a significant position in history of Croatian literature. For more on Šižgorić see: Marin Franičević, pp. 361-366.

50 Koriolan Ćipiko (1425-1493), was one of the first Dalmatian humanists who achieved fame outside his homeland. Koriolan, as a commander of the Trogir trireme, took an active role in the war (1463-1479) and after his return wrote a work named *Petri Mocenici Imperatoris Gesta*. In it he is describing his war experiences. The work was in 1477 published in Venice, and was much praised both because of its historiographical quality, and for purity of its Latin. As a role model for his work Ćipiko took Julius Caesar's classical Latin works. The work later became known as *De bello Asiatico*, according to title of its second edition from 1594. For more see: Koriolan Ćipiko, *O azijskom ratu* (About the Asian War), tr. Vedran Gligo. (Split: Čakavski Sabor, 1977) pp. 7-52.; Marin Franičević, pp. 366-371.

51 Ilija Crijević member of Ragusan patriciate, the family of *Cerva*, was a famous orator and poet. First education he received in Ragusa from where he left first to Ferrara and then to Rome, where he attended the academy of famous Pomponio Leto. Among the Croats he was the second one to earn the title of poet laureate (the first was also Ragusan Petar Menčetić). For more see Marin Franičević, pp. 392-399.

52 Jakov Bunić from Ragusa, published the first Croatian epic *De Raptu Cerberi* in 1490. For more see Ibid., 1986, pp. 399-402.

53 Throughout 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century the Latin language was used as a defense from magyarization and germanization attempts. For more see Veljko Gortan and Vladimir Vratović, "Temeljne značajke hrvatskog latinizma" (Fundamental features of Croatian Latinity), *Forum*, no. 8 (1969): pp. 606-636.

peak, and this was the foundation for the development of a Croatian vernacular literature. Although the Croatian vernacular Renaissance literature took a more time to develop, by the 1510's with the Petrarchian poetry of two Ragusan poets, Šiško Menčetić (1457-1527)<sup>54</sup> and Džore Držić (1461-1501),<sup>55</sup> known as the "first light of Croat language", and especially through works in vernacular by Marko Marulić (Marcus Marullus Spalatensis, 1450-1524),<sup>56</sup> from Split, it became fully affirmed and accepted literary form among Dalmatian humanists. It was to reach its heights during the 16<sup>th</sup> century in works by such Croatian writers as the Ragusans Mavro Vetranović and Marin Držić, then Hvarans Hanibal Lucić, Petar Hektorović, Mikša Pelegrinović (all three were Pribojević's contemporaries) and Petar Zoranić.

Finally, writing in Italian was also a constitutive part of the heritage of Croatian Renaissance. The Italian language began to penetrate into the Dalmatian communes very early. Strong economic and social links of Dalmatia and Italy, dating from 12<sup>th</sup> century, as Tomislav Raukar has argued, have contributed more to the spread of the Italian language than the establishment of a new political center in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>57</sup> However, Italian was present in many spheres, as a language of administration, trade, science and even everyday life.

One of the first works in Italian was published in 1458, written by the Ragusan humanist Beno Kotruljević (*Benedetto Cotrugli*). His book "*Dell'a mercatura et del mercante perfetto*" was one of the first works about trade in the European literature. He was followed by many Croatian humanists, who in the 16<sup>th</sup> century published their poems or scientific works into Italian. These included Ragusans Nikša Vitov Gučetić who published all of his dialogs in Italian and Mario Caboga, who also wrote his scientific works in Latin and poems in Croatian and Italian. Furthermore, even Pribojević's *Oratio* would be translated into Italian and published in 1595, as *Oratione di M. Vincenzo Priboevo. Dalmatino di Lesina, già recitata da lui nella medesima Citta et hora tradotta dalla lingua latina nell'italliana da Belisario Malaspali di Spalato*.<sup>58</sup>

All of these reasons compelled Eduard Hercigonja to name Croatian literary creativity as trilingual and triple alphabetical.

Another important feature of the Croatian Renaissance must be taken into consideration. Croatian Humanism was born and grew in the presence of the Ottoman menace. It was deeply influenced by it and the Turkish motif is present in the works of Croatian humanists in a variety of genres, ranging from obvious anti-Turkish orations to poems, dramas, biographies, historiography, etc.

Nothing marked Croatian Renaissance literature more profoundly than a century of warfare, destruction and defeats. The deep scar of the catastrophic defeat of the Croats at Krbava in 1493, as Tomislav Raukar called it, left its mark also in

---

54 Marin Franičević, pp. 299-315.

55 Ibid., pp. 315-337.

56 The person and work of Marko Marulić will be discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs, here its worth noting only that during his life he was the central figure of Dalmatian humanism, and the most famous of Dalmatian humanists.

57 Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, p. 382.

58 For a detailed study of the poli-lingual character of Croatian literature, see Rafo Bogišić, "Polilingvizam u hrvatskoj književnosti (Poli-lingualism in Croatian Literature)" in *Zrcalo duhovno (književne studije)* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1997) pp. 167-180.

contemporary Croatian poetry.<sup>59</sup> In the same manner the Turkish raids of the fields around Šibenik, Split or Zadar were vividly recorded in the works of Croatian humanists, Juraj Šižgorić, Šimun Kožić Benja (Simon Begnius, 1480-1536)<sup>60</sup> and Marko Marulić.

The period from 1512 -1523 saw the highest concentration of anti-Turkish orations, the reason for this being the fifth Lateran Council (1512-1517). Several Dalmatian prelates attended the Lateran sessions, and some like Bernardino Zane, Archbishop of Split in 1512, and Šimun Kožić Benja (Bishop of Modruš, in 1513 and again in 1516, gave their anti-Turkish speeches in front of this illustrious audience. Even after the end of the Council, this practice continued with the same intensity.<sup>61</sup>

For Dalmatian humanists, the dilemma of living a life of *otium* or *negotium* was probably one easier to solve than elsewhere in Europe. The sorry state of the *patria* caused by the Ottoman advance actually presented humanists with choice of staying or leaving. But even among those who left, many did not forget the troubles of the homeland and dedicated their energies to anti Turkish activities, either through diplomatic service or literary works in the genre of anti-Turkish literature. Such were the cases of Fran Trankvil Andreis (Andronicus Tranquillus Parthenius, 1490-1571) from Trogir, who gave several anti-Turkish orations directed to Germans, Poles, and the Pope, and Antun Vrančić from Šibenik, who dedicated the entire life in anti-Turkish activity.<sup>62</sup> Some like Petar Berislavić, took even more active role. Although a bishop, Berislavić in 1513 accepted appointment to the position of the Croat ban, and replaced the bishops hat and staff with the helmet and the mace, vigorously defending an already collapsing Croatian line of defense around Una River until his death in Plješevica in 1520.

### 3.3. Dalmatian Republic of Letters

In his work Pribojević left us with a "*who is who*" list of the most prominent members of Dalmatian Republic of letters, both in the past and present.<sup>63</sup> Slobodan Prosperov Novak, in his synthesis of Croatian literature labeled this as one of the

59 For study on influence of Croat defeat at Krbava on development of Croatian literature see Rafo Bogišić, "Krbavska katastrofa 1493 i rađanje hrvatske proze (Catastrophe at Krbava and the birth of Croatian literature)" in *Zrcalo Duhovno* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1997) pp. 7-12.

60 Born in Zadar, Šimun Kožić Benja became Bishop of Modruš, a bishoprics on the estates of Frankapan family, one exposed to frequent Ottoman attacks. In Rome, in 1513, he gave his first anti Turkish Oration, published few years later. Again in 1516 he gave his more known oration, named "Desolated Croatia" (*De Corvatiæ desolatione*) which was also published, and achieved considerable success. The Oratio was dominated by accusing tone, directed toward papacy which spends money on luxury while Christians are dying. Further fame Benja acquired when in 1530/1531 he founded a Glagolitic printing press in Rijeka. See Vedran Gligo, 1977, pp. 323-337.; Marin Franičević, pp. 339-340.

61 Vedran Gligo, compiled and edited a collection of the major Croatian anti Turkish orations and literary works. For detailed overview and the orations see: Vedran Gligo, *Govori protiv Turaka* (Anti-Turkish Orations) (Split: Logos, 1983)

62 Thanks to his rich humanist activity and significant political role he played in 16<sup>th</sup> century, there exist extensive literature concerning the person of Antun Vrančić. But for introductory data, and as a starting point see Marianna D. Birnbaum, *Humanists in a Shattered World* (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1986) pp. 213-240.

63 Pribojević, 1997, p. 81.

first attempts at a literary history of Croatia.<sup>64</sup> The list contains 23 authors, some of whom were at the time already dead, such as Koriolan Cipiko or a little older, Ragusan Dominican Ivan Stojković (*Ioannes Stoycus de Raguseo*),<sup>65</sup> a professor at the Sorbonne. But the majority of the members were active participants in the cultural life of Dalmatia.

The list contains both Dalmatian humanists active in Dalmatia and those working outside their homeland. In it we find the already mentioned Ivan Statalić, but also the famous Trankvil Andreis from Trogir, Ivan Polikarp (*Joannes Barbula Polycarpus Severitanus*) from Šibenik, then Fanjo Nigretić (*Pescennius Franciscus Niger Venetus Liburnus*), of Croatian origin but born in Venice, and Juraj Dragišić (*Georgius Benignus Argentinensis de Salviatis*) Franciscian from Srebrenica. Present on the list are representatives from almost all Dalmatian communes, Ragusans Ivan and Ilija Goce, from Zadar Šimun Kožić Benja and Frederik Girsogono (*Fredericus Chrysogonus*, 1472-1538), from Split Toma Niger and from Kotor two distinguished Dominicans, the brothers Vinko and Dominik Buća. Furthermore, Latin writers and vernacular ones (like Hvarans Hanibal Lucić, Petar Hektorović and Mikša Pelegrinović) are equally present on it. Although the list does not include all humanists of the time, it is a fairly complete picture of the Dalmatian literary community from the beginning of the century.

Not surprisingly, at the top of the list, Pribojević placed Marko Marulić a "new light of our time", as he styled him. Marulić was a central figure of the Croatian Renaissance in the 15<sup>th</sup> and the first decades of 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>66</sup> This Croatian arch-humanist is a perfect example of the diversities and richness of Croatian Renaissance. In his opus, one can find a synthesis of all features of Croatian Renaissance literature.<sup>67</sup>

The wider European audience knew Marulić thanks to his Latin opus, of which the best known works were *De institutione bene vivendi per exempla Sanctorum* (Venice, 1506), *Evangelistarium* (Venice, 1516) and *De humilitate et gloria Christi* (Venice, 1516), all belonging to the genre of Christian moral theology. Until the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century *De institutione* was reprinted 21 times, and *Evangelistarium* had 10

64 Slobodan P. Novak, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti, Od humanističkih početaka do Kašićeve ilirske gramatike iz 1604.* (History of Croatian Literature), vol. 2. (Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus, 1997) pp. 226.

65 Ragusan Ivan Stojković (? - 1443) member of the Dominican order, was one of the participants of events related to division within Catholic Church in the first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Stojković took active part at the Church Councils of Constance, Siena-Pavia and Basel. Stojković actively supported the fraction which tried to reform the church from within. He was also an initiator of an idea to establish the Dominican University in Ragusa (1424), a suggestion that was carefully ignored by Ragusan government. For more information see Franjo Šanjek, "Ivan Stojković i počeci humanizma u Hrvata" (Ivan Stojković and beginnings of the Humanism among the Croats), in *Dani hvarskog kazališta: Hrvatski humanizam - Ianus Panonius* (Split: književni krug, 1990) pp. 272-285.

66 There is an extensive literature on Marko Marulić, but for a short introduction and starting point see Martin Franičević, 1986. pp. 253-299.; Mihovil Kombol, pp. 81-94; Slobodan P. Novak, *Povijest hrvatske književnosti, Od humanističkih početaka do Kašićeve ilirske gramatike iz 1604.* (History of Croatian Literature. From the humanistic beginnings to the Kašić's grammar of 1604), vol. 2. (Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus, 1997) pp. 163-216.

67 The following paragraphs cover only small part of his entire opus, dealing only with one or two of his most representative works for the particular subject in question. For a full overview of his work see the list of literature from previous footnote.

editions.

However Marulić did not write only in Latin. Because of his works in vernacular, in Croatian literary history he is today known as the "father of Croatian literature." In 1501, during the Venetian-Turkish War of 1499-1502, under the influence of the Ottoman raids of the area surrounding Split, he wrote his allegorical epic *Judita*, in which he used the biblical plot of a pious widow Judith who killed General Holofernes and saved her city. Although written in 1501, *Judita* remained unpublished until 1521, it was soon followed by two subsequent editions, 1522 and 1523. Most probably, the impulse for this came from the renewal of Turkish raids in 1520's. *Judita* was not the first book published in Croatian, but its influence on the Dalmatian humanists was deep. Due to the appeal of its biblical allegory, fitting these gloomy times so well, it reached immense popularity in all the Dalmatian communes. This allegory was intended by Marulić to give hope to his contemporaries, and that is why he decided to compose it in the vernacular so that it could be read by those who had not attended higher schools.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, his authority as the most famous Croatian writer of his time gave high support to further development of vernacular literature.

This, however, does not exhaust all areas of Marulić's literary activity. In 1522, motivated by new series of Turkish raids, he wrote an epistle to Pope Hadrian VI, thus joining the long line of Dalmatian humanists who before him unsuccessfully tried to motivate Europe to assist against the Turkish invasion. The epistle was published in Rome in 1524, but Marulić had not lived to see it. He died five months earlier.

#### **4. Beyond the Horizon**

By the 1520's, the Ottoman Empire was a European reality, it had become unavoidable part in the *strategem* of European powers. Although hopes and calls for a crusade to throw the Turks out of Europe never ceased, the chances for such a development were smaller and smaller with every new Ottoman conquest.

In the meanwhile, the consequences of the Ottoman thrust had a profound impact on Dalmatia of Pribojević's time. The first consequence, whose symptoms could already be noticed at the time of Pribojević's oration, was a transformation of the Dalmatian urban communal society into a frontier society. Beginning from the 1480's the landscape began to change significantly. A series of new small fortifications called *Kaštela* were built in order to provide shelter for the peasant population from sudden Turkish raids, larger villages began to erect stone walls for their protection and Dalmatian communes themselves began to repair and modernize their fortifications. With the significant territorial losses in two 16<sup>th</sup> century wars, Venetian possessions on the eastern coast of Adriatic were reduced to its smallest territorial span ever. With its local economy in ruin, cut off from its hinterland, the source of its trade incomes, Dalmatia was to be reduced to the role of the *limes*, securing Venetian control of the Adriatic Sea.

It was less than a century earlier that Dalmatia had been lost for the joint Hungarian-Croatian kingdom, and the Croat ethnic body became divided into three polities: the

---

68 " ... ki nisu naučni knjige latinske ali dijačke" Marin Franičević, p. 255.



Hungarian-Croatian kingdom, Republic of Venice and Republic of Ragusa. Yet the Ottoman thrust produced a more serious change. Instead of simply shifting the political borders of the region yet another time, what it did was to create a new borderlands of a more persisting kind: those social cultural and ethnic. It caused massive migrations of population, thus breaking the so far compact Croatian ethnic body.

The first phase of the Ottoman conquest consisted of devastating raids aimed at the destruction of economic bases of Christian feudal societies through terrorizing the local population in order to break its will to fight and force it to flee. Such a specific Ottoman offensive strategy created a vast empty space in the borderlands.

The space on both sides of border was later in the times of peace repopulated. Sometimes it was done with the local population that decided to return, but more often with immigrants from the Balkan hinterlands. These new colonists were stockholders, nomadic peoples, mainly of Orthodox faith and Slavs. Encouraged by the social privileges granted by the Ottoman state in return for their military services, they moved from their homelands and settled the empty regions of borderlands. Some did not stop at borders of the empires and moved into the deserted territories of Croatia and Dalmatia where they soon formed the same kind of military border societies.

This new population in the Venetian sources was called the Morlachs or Vlachs. The name is quite problematic, because it possesses a history of its own. Vlachs or Morlachs was originally a name for the Romanic population of the Balkan peninsula, but through the Middle Ages it went through a transformation, and became a social designator, identifying nomadic tribes which also performed some special services, as soldiers or couriers.<sup>69</sup> In the conquered territories the Ottomans used the existing system and defined its own set of Vlach-privileges also linked to the border service. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century the term acquired its broadest meaning, when it was used by Venetians to refer to all Ottoman subjects of the hinterland.<sup>70</sup>

The appearance of the Morlachs in the Ottoman conquered territories of Dalmatia and Croatia, changed forever the ethnic picture of the region. These new settlers were met with suspicion, distrusts and resent by the urban population of Dalmatian towns. Paladio Fosco, in his work "Description of the Illyrian Coast," written around 1510, left us with an interesting description of Dalmatia of that time. In his description of the northern Dalmatian border the following passage is found:

The side that looks to the North is more tame, and is shaded by trees. All of its inhabitants are called *Morolachi*, and resembles more wild beasts than humans, they live on milk and cheese, and hiding by the road attack and rob foreign travelers. Finally, the highest praise they hold is to live of plunder. However, the mountain itself they call "the chain of the world," and consider it to stretch from the Alps to the Adriatic Sea.<sup>71</sup>

---

69 Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, pp 138-139, 432-433.

70 The full analysis of the usage of names of Vlachs and Morlachs and problems of ethnic identity, is beyond the scope of this work. For good introductory overview of this problematic see Catherin W. Bracewell, *The Uskoks of Senj. Piracy, Banditry and Holy War in the Sixteenth-Century Adriatic*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992) pp. 1-50.

71 *qua vero Septentrionem spectat mollior, et arboribus opacus; Cuius incolae uno omnes vocabulo Morolachi vocantur, qui ferinum potius, quam humanum aspectumprae es ferentes lacte, caseoque victitant, et prope vias abditi viatore alienigenas adoriuntur, atque dispoliant; Denique*

This is how the urban Dalmatian community in the process of becoming the European periphery saw the rude and wild nomadic population in its neighborhood, living in the mountains, that represented the end of their (civilized) world.

---

summam laudem esse putant ex rapto vivere, Monatem autem ipsum mundi catenam nuncupant. Paladije Fusko, *Opis obale Ilirika* (Description of the Illyrian Coast) tr. Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, (Zagreb: Latina et Graeca, 1990) p.90. ; Furthermore almost in word identical description of Vlachs living in the same region by unnamed Venetian official from 1553. See Catherin W. Bracewell, pp. 30-31.

## Chapter II: *Oratio de origine successibusque Slavorum*

### 1. The Oration in the Context of its Contemporary Discursive Practices

When it was published in 1532, Pribojević's *Oratio* was among the first of its kind in Dalmatian/Croatian historiography. It abandoned the use of medieval forms of the chronicle or the annals, only laying out events, but it was instead inspired by a revival of antiquity and the art of rhetoric. Furthermore the timespan and territorial scope it encompassed was previously unknown in Croatian historiography. The purpose of this section is to define the broader intellectual context of Pribojević's work, and then based on analysis of its form, content and structure to position it in the same.

#### 1.1. Defining the Genre, and the Main Features of the Text

A content analysis of *Oratio*, due to its three partite structure and variety of content contained in them, reveals more than one possible solution to the problem of positioning this work in a distinct literary genre. At first sight, it falls into the category of the literary genre known as *Laudatio patriae*, one inspired by Leonardo Bruni famous *Laudatio Florentinae Urbis* (1403/4).<sup>72</sup> *Oratio* was a patriotic praise of Pribojević's homeland and his hometown, proud of its civic society, ancient traditions and high urban culture. More than two-thirds of the work is dedicated to Dalmatia and Hvar. But Pribojević's work was much more than just literary praise of *patria*, it was also an attempt to write a grand history of the Slavs, according to the scholarly standards of its time. The entire first part, more than one-third of the entire Oration is a history of the Slavs. Its main focus is on the ancient history of the Slavs in general, and Dalmatia in particular. Furthermore, its detailed mythical genealogy providing a biblical origin for the Slavic nations, and visible underrepresentation of the Middle Ages,<sup>73</sup> all the distinctive features of contemporary Renaissance historiography, categorize this work as one truly belonging to this genre.

However, some features of *Oratio* still remain unaccounted for. Only its first part is purely historical in its content, but the second and the third part, as noted, dedicated to Dalmatia and Hvar, are dominated not by historical, but rather by geography, cultural and ethnographic information about the Dalmatians, Dalmatia and the Island of Hvar.<sup>74</sup> In this, Pribojević joins a long line of Renaissance writers of

<sup>72</sup> For more on influence of Bruni on Renaissance historiography see Hans Baron, *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni. Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature*. (Chicago: The Chicago University Press, 1968) and Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985) pp. 3-9.

<sup>73</sup> In the first part of the oration Middle Ages are almost completely omitted. In the second part only historical event from Middle Ages that is mentioned is one Pribojević could not omit, namely submission of Hvar to rule of the Venice in the 11<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>74</sup> This aspect of Pribojević's work has been explored in detail by Grga Novak in his Introduction to 1951 edition of the *Oratio*. Pribojević paints with very vivid colors Dalmatia and his home town of Hvar, providing his readers with variety of ethnographic information. His description of Hvar is of extraordinary interest for historians both as a witness document about Hvar and Dalmatia at

historical-geographical surveys, inspired by Flavio's Biondo immensely popular *Italia Illustrata* (Rome 1474), who Pribojević lists among his sources and quotes ten times.

On the other hand, with benefit of the hindsight, namely the development of an early pan-Slavic literary movement of the 17<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>75</sup> the genre that Pribojević's oration should be assigned to is that of the so-called "Illyrian literature." He was the first of Croatian scholars to articulate and in scholarly manner present the concept of a wider Slavic unity, an association of the Illyrians with the (South) Slavs, the myth of Slavic origin that gave them biblical forefathers, published privilege of Alexander the Great to the Slavs and introduced the legend of three brothers from Croatia/Dalmatia as founders of the kingdoms of the Czechs, Poles and Russians, in Croatian historiography. In this manner, Pribojević's *Oratio* can be given the honor of being one of the founding texts of the entire genre.

From Middle Ages, Renaissance historiography inherited the image of the world as one divided into *gentes* and *nationes*,<sup>76</sup> and by use of extensive research of works by ancient authors, began to develop the existing medieval myths and to incorporate in them into recent discoveries found in the works of antiquity. Frank Borchardt in his study of German renaissance myths described the situation as one similar to a kaleidoscopic image. The common set of ideas and beliefs, contained in a limited corpus of available texts, written both by the Christian fathers or ancient pagan authors, served as a pool of building blocks. Like the kaleidoscope, each author rearranges elements according to his own needs and understanding, and suddenly the picture presented was one quite familiar but at the same time new and unrecognizable.<sup>77</sup> Pribojević was no exception to this methodology.

## 2. Myth as the Axis of Pribojević's Oratio

The search for the reasons of the success of Pribojević's *Oratio* among Dalmatian humanists begins with its title: *Oratio De Origines successibusque Slavorum*. In it, the author clearly reveals his intention; to provide an answer to one of the fundamental question for any community, "where do we come from and thus who we are?"

Before proceeding, it would be useful to define the meaning of the term "myth" in the way it is used in the following discussion. A definition offered by Peter Burke, "as a

---

the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, but also because Pribojević mentions several antique ruins on the island of Hvar which are up to date unknown to us. For good overview of the above see Grga Novak, 1951, pp. 9-47.

75 For more about the 17<sup>th</sup> century pan-Slavism in Croatian literature see Rafo Bogišić, "Hrvatski barokni slavizam (Croatian Baroque Slavism)," in *Zrcalo duhovno, književne studije* (Zagreb, 1997) pp. 133-164.; Radoslav Katičić, "Ilirci i ilirski jezik (Illyrians and Illyrian Language)" *Forum* no.56 (1988) pp. 675-688.; Zdenko Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come, The Counter-Reformation, the Republic of Dubrovnik, and the Liberation of the Balkan Slavs* (New York: East European Monographs, 1992) pp. 425-454.

76 For more on the origin and the development of this concept in the early centuries of Middle Ages see the study by Patrick Geary, *Myths of the Nations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002) pp. 41-62.

77 Frank L. Borchardt, *German antiquity in renaissance myths* (Baltimore : Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), pp. 177-178.

fiction passing as a fact"<sup>78</sup> seems too narrow and does not cover all aspects of the problem, mainly that of its reception, and difference from other similar structures such as the saga, fairy tale etc. with which it shares a narrative form.

Myth holds at least two meanings. First that of simple imaginative fable and second that of fundamental and final truth common to all peoples.<sup>79</sup> Unlike the saga or fairy tale, its primary function is not a "veneration of the past, moral lessons or explanation of inexplicable phenomena," but it should rather be understood as a "means by which a culture organizes, interprets and gives authority to its most cherished assumptions about itself and the world."<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, the core content of the myth is not based on some available evidence or proof, but on wide acceptance of it by the members of a particular culture. The famous Polish historian Jerzy Topolski called this type of knowledge "immobilized" and further labeled its content as sacral in character.<sup>81</sup> The myth exists in acceptance of those who are ready to believe it to be true, regardless of other possible explanations. Another important feature of the myth is that it is recognized as such only when it stops being valid; up to that moment it is unrecognizable from other historical facts.<sup>82</sup>

This brings us back to Pribojević's story of the past, as Jerzy Topolski in his essay about myths in the research of the past concludes "No historical works are free of myths; it is only the degree of their presence that differs."<sup>83</sup> The importance of the previous exposé is because in the case of Pribojević's narration the starting point is a myth, more concretely a myth of origin.

### **2.1. Renaissance Historiography and the Myths of Origin.**

Since the times of antiquity, a search for origins and forefathers is present among learned men. One can trace this passion from Hesiod's *Theogony* in which the charts of origins of the Greek people, together with a lineage of the gods are presented, to the more general attempts made in the Bible and in work of Joseph Flavius, where the lineage for the entire human race is provided. The former were not only attempts to locate one's own origins and ancestors, but rather to categorize and explain the history of humanity itself.

Renaissance historiography, born out of medieval historiography, widened its focus, changed its literary form, purpose, concept of time and attitude towards the analytical approach to documents,<sup>84</sup> but in spite of all the 'scientific' achievements the mythical was still not abandoned as a valid *historical* content. Whether it was the history of the city, a commune, dynasty, or entire nation, an unavoidable component of each such narrative was the myth of origin. In some cases it was a legacy of the Middle Ages, like the Troy origins of the Franks and the Roman heritage of Florence. In other cases they were pure Renaissance constructions, such as the Sarmatian origins of the Poles or the Gaul heritage of the French. Furthermore, those were not just entertaining fabulous stories, intended to amuse the reader at the beginning of

<sup>78</sup> Peter Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1969 ) p. 7.

<sup>79</sup> Frank Borchardt, p.13.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>81</sup> Jerzy Topolski, "Myths In Research Into The Past," *Acta Polonice Historica*, vol. 81 (2000): p.6.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>84</sup> Peter Burke, pp. 8-20

the narrative. In many cases the choice of selected myth was used to promote a specific political identity based on a specific ancestry the particular myth of origin promoted. Thus the Roman origin of Florence was connected to Republican Rome and not the Imperial one, in order to justify the city's republican government. On the other hand, the Troy myth of the Franks origin was a purely monarchical one, while as in case of Francois Hotman's *FRANCOGALLIA*, the fusion of Franks and Gauls was used to promote a more constitutional form of government, one limiting royal power.

Nevertheless, the majority of 15<sup>th</sup> and early 16<sup>th</sup> century histories had one feature in common, namely the vision of the world in accordance with the dogma of the Catholic church, and consequently an understanding of humanity as being the offspring of Noah and his three sons: Ham, Shem and Japhet. Among these three Japhet was seen as a forefather of all European nations.<sup>85</sup> Vinko Pribojević as a good "*sacre Theologiae professor*,"<sup>86</sup> fully complied with this tradition. Accordingly for him there was no dilemma how his story should begin:

Let me commence this investigate in the greatness and nobility of the race which today is called by its new name as a Slavic nation, by recalling to your memory, vigorous men, the well known flood from the times of Noah, ...<sup>87</sup>

The only problem was how to connect the Slavs to the descendants of Noah. Neither the books of Genesis nor Joseph Flavius in his *Antiquity of the Jews*, nor later St. Jerome's works contained any mention of them.<sup>88</sup> The only way to solve this problem was to incorporate the Slavs into the genealogy of some other ancient people as was the usual practice of other Renaissance historians who faced a similar problem. But in which one?

Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and unto them were sons born after the flood.

The sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.<sup>89</sup>

## 2.2. In Search for the Forefather

---

85 The basic framework for the myth of biblical origin was contained in the corpus of texts made of: the books of Genesis, Joseph Flavius *Antiquitatum Iudicarum*, various works by St. Jerome (especially *Liber hebraicarum questionum in genesim*), with additional information that could be found in Isidor's *Etymologiae*, Jordanes *History of the Goths* and Orosius *Historiarum adversum paganos libri VII*.

86 This is how, in the title of his book, Pribojević presents himself to the readers. Pribojević, 1997. p. 55.

87 *Amplitudinem et nobilitatem generis, quod nunc nouo quidem uocabulo Slaourm natio dicitur, repetenti a Noetico illo memorabili diluuiio, uiri integerrimi, exordiendum mihi esse puto, ...* Pribojević, 1997, p. 57.

88 According to the story from book of Genesis, Japhet had seven sons, and from his offspring all European nations sprang forth. Of those seven, Gomer was the father of the Gauls, Javan was the father of the Greeks, Magog father of the Scythians, Thobel was the father of Iberians, Madai of the ancient Medes, Moscheni of the Capadocians and Thyrras was the father of the Thracians. The book of Genesis X.; Joseph Flavius. *Jewish antiquities*, 1.6.1.

89 *The Holy Bible, New International Version: containing the Old Testament and the New Testament* (Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1984) p. 25.

What were Pribojević's goals concerning the myth of origin? In other words, which conditions the myth of origin he was after should have been able to fulfill? First, it should not be exclusive, it had to enable the inclusion of other (ancient) *nationes* and their myths, legends and histories into the fabric of Pribojević's grand history that would be born out of this myth of origin. And second, it should support the autochtonity of the Slavs on the Balkan peninsula, and thus their identification with ancient Illyrians. Of the two, the idea of autochtonity of the Slavs in these regions was an old belief. It could be traced to the Middle Ages, to the so-called Nestor's chronicle<sup>90</sup> of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, in which the lands around Danube are identified as the homeland of the Slavs. Afterwards, the idea of the origin of the Slavs from the South, either from Pannonia, Dalmatia or Croatia is present in various Czech and Polish medieval chronicles. On the other hand, association of (south) Slavs with ancient Illyrians was a new theory in Dalmatia.

### 2.2.1. Illyrian Heritage

The Illyrian theory had its roots in the humanist practice to use ancient names for contemporary nations. As far as it is known, the oldest known case of such association of the Illyrian name for the inhabitants of the 15<sup>th</sup> century Balkan peninsula, dates from 1441. In the archives of Trogir, preserved is the document written in Italian language, however containing an interesting note, namely, that it is a translation of the original, written in *sermone et alphabeto Illiracho seu Sclavonico*.<sup>91</sup> The Illyrian name was quickly adopted by Croatian and Dalmatian Humanists, because it provided a solution to the problem of discontinuity, and supported their claim of the ancient heritage of Dalmatia and Illyria.<sup>92</sup>

Inspired by the rising humanistic spirit of his time, Juraj Šižgorić from Šibenik in 1487 wrote a small work, named *De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici* (Concerning the position of Illyria and the town of Šibenik). *De situ Illyriae* served as a role model and a template to Pribojević for his work.<sup>93</sup> Since *De situ Illyriae* was in its character

90 "Latopis Nestora" in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 1 (Warsaw:Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1960) pp. 552-553. (henceforth Nestor, *Latopis*)

91 Mentioned Illyrian alphabet could refer both to the Cyrillic letters and to *Bosančica* (western version of Cyrillic letters). Radoslav Katičić, "Ilirci i ilirski jezik" (The Illyrians and the Illyrian Language), *Forum*, no. 56 (1988): p.677.

92 Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, *Tradicija*, pp. 155-164.

93 In his study, Gortan Veljko has noted that the structure of Pribojević's text closely follows the structure of Šižgorić's *De situ Illyriae*, written in 1487. Šižgorić's work was also divided into three parts. The first one, dedicated to the Illyria (wider homeland), second one to Dalmatia and Dalmatians and the third one to the authors hometown of Šibenik. Although *De situ Illyriae* was not published until 1899, and Pribojević never mentions Šižgorić's work as a source for any of informations found in his work, Veljko Gortan in his study, based on the use of the same references on the ancient authors, namely Strabo, Plinius, Cicero and Vergilius together with structural similarities of both works, claims that Pribojević was familiar with Šižgorić's text and furthermore that he used it as a template for his oration. Furthermore Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff pointed out at further similarities, such as question of St. Jerome and identification of Roman Emperors or Popes born in Dalmatia as Dalmatians, like in the case of the Emperor Diocletian and Pope Gaius IV. For more see: Veljko Gortan, "Juraj Šižgorić i Vinko Pribojević" (Juraj Šižgorić and Vinko Pribojević), *Filologija*, vol. 2 (1960): pp. 149-152. For information on Juraj Šižgorić see: Marin Franičević, 1986, pp.361-365; Juraj Šižgorić, *O smještaju Ilirije i o gradu Šibeniku* (Concerning the Position of the Illyria and the Town of Šibenik) (Šibenik: Muzej grada, 1981) (henceforth Šižgorić, *De Situ*); Also see Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff, "Il Priboevo et il 'Regno degli

more of a descriptive and geographic work, it did not solve the problem of origin or that of autochtonity of the Slavs. Furthermore, Šižgorić avoided the usage of the Slav name, and used only the ancient names Dalmatian and Illyrian when referring to the inhabitants of Dalmatia and the Balkan peninsula. Nevertheless, *De situ Illyriae* pointed in the direction in which Pribojević with his more elaborate work would follow.

After having clarified Pribojević's goal, I will attempt to reconstruct his search for suitable beginnings of the Slavs, positioning his narrative in the context of its contemporary discursive practices. What follows is an overview of three historiographical traditions that most influenced Pribojević's choice of the myth of origin, German, Dalmatian and Polish.<sup>94</sup> Although the direct influence of German Renaissance historiography on Pribojević was marginal,<sup>95</sup> its influence on another for him more important historiographic tradition, that of the Slavic Poland, makes German historiography a plausible starting position.

### 2.2.2. German Historiographical Tradition

German Renaissance historians who opted in their works for a biblical myth of origin<sup>96</sup> for the Germans, faced a problem similar to Pribojević. That is, the lack of data about the Germans in the corpus of fundamental Christian texts. The first most radical, and very soon abandoned solution was to claim direct origin from Adam. The next solution that satisfied many was to claim a vague descent from Magog<sup>97</sup> or Gomer without any need for an elaborate genealogy. Another choice made by historians was to find the forefathers in the second or third generation of Japhet's sons, whose names could have been found in the corpus of Church fathers or the Bible itself. The other possible strategy was to invent a completely new set of sons of

---

Slavi' di Mauro Orbini." *Rievichere slavistiche*, no. 22-23 (1975-1976) p. 145-146. (henceforth Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff, *Il Priboevo* )

94 The above statement does not (by any chance) exclude the influence of the Italian Renaissance historiography on Pribojević. Its influence is immense and unavoidable, but it does not concern the subject in question, the search for suitable myth of origin. Italian Renaissance historiography served as a role model, provided the form and the inspiration, but Italian authors could not provide any solution or a new information not contained in works of ancient authors to the question of the Slav origin. For example, concerning the origins of Slavs, the only information Pribojević could get from Sabellico (the most cited author in his work, he quotes him 26 times) is that of the coming of the Slavs to the Balkan peninsula during the reign of Emperor Justinian in the sixth century. The information that Pribojević not only did not needed, but did not wish to consider, because it contradicted with his belief in autochtonity of the Slavs in the Balkan peninsula.

95 As his sources Pribojević's cites two German 15<sup>th</sup> century "bestsellers", Werner Rolevnick's *Fascilus temporum* (1474), and Hartman Schedel, *Liber Chronicarum* (1493).

96 In his study on the German Renaissance myths, Franck Borchardt, has categorized German myths of origin in three main category: classical (direct descent from some nation from some nation of Antiquity, such as Saxon descent from Macedonians, Franks from Troy, etc.), Germanic (this option is based on descent from some particular German tribe by means of flight and exile of part of its members, as was the case of Swiss and Swabians) and finally biblical myths of origin. For more see Franck Borchardt, pp. 22-25.

97 This was part of the heritage of the Middle Ages and was based on the works of early Church fathers, which designated Biblical Magog (so far father of Scythians) as the father of the invading Goths. At the core of this claim was St. Jerome's records from "Hebrew Question in Genesis", where he identifies Goths and Getae, and offers two line of descent: Gomer is the father of the Gaetae, Magog of the Scythians, and Gog and Magog together of the Goths. See Hayward C. T. R., tr. *Saint Jerom's Hebrew Question in Genesis*, (Oxford: Claredon Press, 1995) p. 39.



Japhet or even Noah, allegedly born to him after the flood. This method was used to reconcile two relevant traditions, that of pagan antiquity and Christianity, and incorporate into the biblical myth of origin persons and events from works of pagan authors.<sup>98</sup>

Nevertheless, apart from this apparent similarity, 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century German Renaissance writers actually enjoyed an advantage over Pribojević, namely the existence of records concerning Germans in various texts by pagan authors. Of which the most famous was Tacitus *Germania*,<sup>99</sup> known to German humanists since the 1470's. Furthermore, abundant information concerning the Goths, Vandals and other Germanic tribes could be found in the works of early Church Fathers, such as Paulus Orosius<sup>100</sup> and especially Jordanes whose *Deeds of the Goths* published for the first time in 1515, were republished six more times in the sixteenth century.<sup>101</sup> No such materials were available to Slavic historians of the 15<sup>th</sup> and early 16<sup>th</sup> century, until the discovery of Constantin Porphyrogenitus and his *De Administrando Imperio* in the first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Information about the Slavs was rare, and what is even more problematic, unfavorable to them. The situation is best summarized by Pribojević himself:

Alas, how much of our glory has been lost because in so many years no one could be found to present to the eyes of the future generations uncountable glorious deeds of the Slavs! Even if the writers of the opposing sides have here and there written something about the Slavs, mainly to glorify their own successes, you will see that it is written completely inappropriate and different from the actual events, the reason for this is because pagan authors in majority of historical works only flatter themselves. So you will not doubt that they were talking about the enemy, who was more accustomed to fight in close combat with the sword then with the quill.<sup>102</sup>

### 2.2.3. The Gothic Question

---

98 For example, such was the case with Tuisco, whose name is found in Tacitus *Germania* where he is an earth-born god, father of the hero *Mannus*, and his incorporation in myth of origin. Good example of mentioned practice, concerning Tuisco can be found in the popular *Chronicon*, work of one of the major German humanists Johannes Naucler, published in 1516. Here Tuisco has became son of Noah, the first king of Germans. See Frank Borchardt, p. 120.; Furthermore, especially extreme was the case of Anniius of Viterbo's controversial work published in 1498, which inspired many 16<sup>th</sup> century German historians, where *Tuyscon* is the father of the both Germans and Sarmatians. The problem with this work is that it was an author's fabrication based on Tacitus works. Frank Borchardt, pp. 89-91.

99 For more on usage of Tacitus in German Renaissance political thought see Kenneth C. Schellhase, *Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought* (Chicago and London: 1976). pp. 31-66.; and for usage of Tacitus as a source of information to German Renaissance authors, see Frank Borchardt, pp. 177-181.

100 For influence of *Paulus Orosius* on German Renaissance historiography, see Frank Borchardt, pp. 184-187.

101 For more on usage of Jordanes by German Renaissance historians see Frank Borchardt, pp. 188-191.

102 *Heu quantum gloriae nobis ademptum credimus, quia per multa annorum curricula, qui futurus saeculis innumerabilia Slavorum praeclara opera aspicienda proponerent, defuerunt. Nam si quid sparasim de eis et quasi praeter intentum, dum propria extollunt, ab aduersae factionis auctoribus exaratum fuit, sic ieiune aut aliter, quam res gesta est, scriptum inuenies, quod maiorem sibi historiae ethnicae partem uendicante adulatione eos de hostibus gladio cominus, non autem literis dimicare consuetis fuisse non uerearis.* Pribojević, 1997, p.68

The Goths were a part of almost every German Renaissance chronicle, but throughout the 15<sup>th</sup> century with the discoveries of texts of ancient authors, the attitude towards them changed. At the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, Gobelinus Persona<sup>103</sup> in his *Cosmodromium* wrote: "Slavs that is Vandals, live across the Elbe. Those in neighboring lands, Cracovia, Polonia, Bohemia, and Sclavonia, *speak Gothic, that is Sclavonic*."<sup>104</sup>

In this short passage, one can find some of the common confusing remnants of medieval traditions: identification of the Slavs (in this case the Poles) with Vandals<sup>105</sup> which was a consequence of the confusion of the Slavic Wends with the Vandals, conquerors of Africa and pillagers of Rome, and the most important for this study, the equating of the Gothic and Slavic language.

Thus the question of the Goths comes into focus. What is assumed by the term Gothic question in this study is the problem of the ethnic character of the Goths: Slavic, German or something else. From the previously mentioned passage by Gobelinus, we see that at the beginning of the 15<sup>th</sup> century there existed the notion of language link between the Slavs and Goths. Furthermore, the Goth – Slav association was also present in medieval Dalmatian historiography. This raises to the question of why Pribojević, in his work did not choose Magog, usually identified as the forefather of the Goths, to be the father of the Slavs and develop his story in lines with Gothic-Slavic tradition, one with deep roots in the Dalmatian medieval historiography.

#### 2.2.4. Dalmatian Gothomania

The term Gothomania used by the Croatian historian Ferdo Šišić,<sup>106</sup> refers to a common misbelief of medieval Dalmatian chroniclers in their association of the Slavs

<sup>103</sup>Gobelinsu Persona's *Cosmodromium*, was one of the first universal history written in Latin by a German author. It was written after the Council of Constance (1414-1418) when the first wave of new learning reached Germany, and was widely quoted throughout the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Furthermore, *Cosmodromium* served as one of the most important German historians of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Albertus Krantz. For more see Frank Borchardt, pp. 28-39.

<sup>104</sup>Frank Borchardt, pp. 29-30.

<sup>105</sup>A belief that the Vandals were the ancestors of the Poles, was based on confusion of the Slavic Wends with the Vandals and the fact that territory in ancient times inhabited by the Wends and Vandals was in the Middle Ages settled by the Poles. One of the earliest records of this mistake can be found in *Annales Alamatici*, record of Charlemagne's campaign against the Polab Slavs identifies them as the Vandals (*perrexit in regionem Wandalarum*), but the first among Polish chroniclers to claim Vandalic roots of the Poles was Vincent Kadlubek, Bishop of Cracow (1160 – 1223). In his *Chronica seu originale regum et principum Poloniae*. Kadlubek was the first to record the legendary origin of the Vandal name. According to it, the Poles received their name from river Vistula (*Vandalus*), which in turn received its name from legendary queen Vanda who drown herself in it to avoid a marriage to the Alamanic king. A similar story was repeated later in the chronicle of Bishop Boguchwał, and in the 14<sup>th</sup> century in *Wielkopolska chronicle* and by Dzierzwa from Cracow. For more see Vincentii Kadlubkonis, "Magistri Vincentii Kadlubkonis Chronica Polonorum sive origine regum et principum Poloniae" *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 2 (Warsaw, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961) p. 258; Waclaw Alexander Maciejowski, ed. "Boguphali II episcopi posnaniensis Chronicon Poloniae cum continuatione Paskonis custodis posnaniensis" *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 2 (Warsaw, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961) p. 474. (henceforth Boguchwał); "Wielkopolska chronica" *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. 3 (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961) p.

<sup>106</sup>See Ferdo Šišić, *Letopis popa Dukljanina* (Chronicle of the Dioclean Priest), (Beograd, Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, 1928) pp. 106-121. (henceforth Ferdo Šišić, *Letopis*)

with the Goths. This misunderstanding is a consequence of a fusion of two historical events, the Gothic invasion of the fifth century and the Slavic migration of the sixth and seventh century. Two major works of Dalmatian medieval historiography, both used by Pribojević, contain this notion.

The first of two, to be dealt with is Thoma Archdeacon's, *Historia Salonitana*,<sup>107</sup> written in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Toma, writing a history of the *Salonitan* archbishops in book seven describes the coming of the Goths from Polish and Teutonic lands, under their leader Totila. After the pillage of the province, the Goths split into two groups, Totila and the majority of his army went to Italy, but "seven or eight" of their noble families under the rule of Duke *Got* stayed and made the conquered land their homeland. "Many have called them Goths, but also the Slavs, according to the personal names of those who have come from Polish or Czech lands."<sup>108</sup>

The second of Pribojević's Dalmatian sources, is an immensely problematic text, known in Croatian historiography as *Ljetopis popa Dukljanina* (Chronicle of the Dioclean Priest, henceforth LJPD).<sup>109</sup> The Chronicle contains records of the deeds of the rulers of Dalmatia, Croatia, Dioclea (Duklja) and neighboring lands. Pribojević did not use the Chronicle itself, but rather a Latin translation of its so called *Croatian redaction*,<sup>110</sup> by the most prominent Dalmatian humanist Marko Marulić.<sup>111</sup> In the LJPD the same story of the Goth conquest appears again. The Goths, crude and terrible, and infected by Arian heresy, invaded Dalmatia. After a terrible battle in which king of Istria was killed and the king of Dalmatia was saved only by flight from battlefield, they pillage the land. Afterward, Totila left for Italy, but his brother Stroil stayed in Dalmatia and established his rule.<sup>112</sup>

Furthermore, this tradition was not without its advocates among Dalmatian humanists. One of them was Ludovik Crijević Tuberon (Ludovicus de Cierva, Tubero, 1459-1527),<sup>113</sup> from Ragusa. Tuberon in his *Comentaria suorum temporum*

107Pribojević refers to this work two times, both times under the name *Thoma de euersione Salonarum*. Pribojević, 1997, p. 58; p. 72.

108Toma Arhiđakon, *Kronika: Splitski rukopis* (Chronicle, Split manuscript), tr. Vladimir Rismondo, (Split: Čakavski Sabor, 1977) pp. 32-33.

109Many questions related to the chronicle are still cause of the historical debates. Such as: correct dating of this work, the question of authorship, or whether it is one or two chronicle merged together. So far, the most accepted is its dating, set by Ferdo Šišić, who puts this chronicle at the late 12<sup>th</sup> century. For full debate about it see Ferdo Šišić, *Ljetopis*, pp. 3-184; latest contribution to this discussion is from Eduard Peričić, *Sclavorum regnum Grgura Barskog* (Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1991); Short summary of the problematic concerning the Chronicle, in English, can be found in Zdenko Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come*, (New York: East European Monographs, 1992) pp. 361-374.

110The problem of the LJPD is beyond the scope of this study, for more information see previous footnote. What is of importance is that Pribojević did not use the 'original' transcription of the chronicle, but a Latin translation of the Croatian translation of the original in Latin, known as Croatian redaction. The Croatian translation was in 1510 found by Dominik Papali from Split, and at his request it was translated by Marko Marulić into Latin. One of the copies of this translation was than used by Pribojević. For more information see Ferdo Šišić, *Letopis*, pp. 154-163.

111Pribojević refers to it two times, and names his source as *Mar. Marulus de regibus Illyriorum*. See Pribojević, 1997, p. 66; p. 72.

112Ferdo Šišić, *Letopis*, pp. 381-387.

113For more on Tuberon see Marin Franičević, pp. 386-392.; and Introductory study to the 2001 edition of Tubero's work, Vlado Rezar, "Uvodna studija: Latinitet Ludovika Crijevića Tuberon (Introductory study: Latinity of Ludovik Crijević Tuberon)." In Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, *Komentari o mojem vrmenu* (Comments on my Epoch), ed. Mirko Valentić, tr. Vlado Rezar

(Comments on my Epoch), which was a history of contemporary events in Hungarian-Croatian kingdom covering a period from 1490 until 1522, decided to follow this tradition and associated the Slavs with the Goths.

In spite of this, Pribojević decided not to take the Gothic-Slavic relationship as a basis for his narrative, and to make the descent of the Goths from Magog his choice for myth of origin. Although that choice seems sound, and could be backed by many various sources ranging from St. Jerome to his native Dalmatian chronicles, Pribojević opted for another solution.

Two reasons could have influenced Pribojević's decision. The first is that it does not support one of his initial hypothesis, that of the autochtony of the Slavs, and idea of the Illyrians as a Slavic people. The second reason not to take the Gothic-Slavic myth as starting point of his story (although in his history of the Slavs, he did not forget to make an account of deeds of the Goths as one of the most powerful Slavs ever) was the developments in the German historiography in the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, where apart from the Gothic-Slavic myth, the idea of Gothic-German unity began steadily to gain ground.

By the time of publication of Werner Rolevnick's *Fascilus temporum*<sup>114</sup> in 1474, which Pribojević used as one of his references, the situation began to change. The Goths became an integral part of the German world and historical tradition, and the connections to the Slavic world were no longer mentioned. For Rolevnick's in his earlier book in praise of Saxonia, the Goths stemmed from Magog and are considered as the oldest German tribe.<sup>115</sup> Nevertheless, the Goths were still somehow kept aside. There were two lines of descent, one "German", stemming from Japhet – Tuisco or Tyscon (or what ever was the current variation), and another more simple and straightforward one: Magog – Goths.

The full rehabilitation of the Goths in German historiography came with the works of Albertus Krantz.<sup>116</sup> In 1519, his famous work *Vandalia*, inspired by Tacitus and Jordanes, (especially 1515 edition of his Gothic history) was published. It was soon followed by *Saxonia*, *Dania* and finally *Metropolis*. For Krantz, the Goths were descendants of barbaric German tribes, but the same was the case for all Slavic nations (Vandals, Sarmats, etc.) However, the unity of these people and German-Vandal hegemony from the Don River to the Rhine, was based not on language or cultural unity, since Krantz acknowledged this diversity. It was based on the idea of a universal German monarchy, the fourth and last world empire, according to Biblical prophecies. The foundation of this unity was the legal concept of, in central and east central Europe, widely spread German law (Magdeburg and Lübeck law).<sup>117</sup> This new interpretation, concerning the origin of the Goths and their relationship with the Vandals, provides a link to the next historiographical tradition of interest, one more sympathetic to the Dalmatian humanist, that of a Slavic Poland.

---

(Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001) pp. VII-LXXXVII.

<sup>114</sup>Werner Rolevnick's *Fascilus temporum* was very popular and has been reprinted many times.

Furthermore it is interesting because Pribojević refers to it in his work, most probably he was familiar with it. See Pribojević, 1997, p. 71.

<sup>115</sup>See Frank Borchardt, pp. 71-72.

<sup>116</sup>For information on Albertus Krantz, see Frank Brochardt, pp. 136-141.

<sup>117</sup>For more see Frank Borchardt, pp. 136-142.; and Karin Friedrich, *The Other Prussia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999) pp. 85-87.

### 2.2.5. Polish Historiographical Tradition

In the same year (1525) when Pribojević entertained his audience on the Island of Hvar, to the north in the Polish-Lithuanian state an important event took place. The centuries old struggle between the Teutonic order and Polish kingdom ended. The final phase of the conflict (1520-1525) ceremonially ended on April 15, 1525 on the market square of Cracow when the last of the Grand Masters of the Teutonic order Albert of Hohenzollern, paid homage to the Polish king. This event was preceded by his conversion to Lutheranism and the secularisation of the country. Albert Hohenzolner dissolved what remained of the once powerful Order, turned the country into a secular Duchy, and with Polish support, declared himself Duke of Prussia – vassal of the Polish crown.

Is there a connection between these two events: the abolition of the state of German knight order and the patriotic speech of a Dalmatian Dominican, enriched with pan-Slavic decoration? If one takes into consideration that armed conflict was not the only aspect of the struggle, and that the conquest of new territories was often supported by historical or some other legal claims, the link that connects the Adriatic and Baltic begins to form.

Parallel to armed warfare, Polish historiography of the late 15<sup>th</sup> and early 16<sup>th</sup> century waged its own intellectual war in support of Jagiellonian political claims. History became one of a central issues for contemporary political debates, the past was consciously used as an instrument for the expression of present political needs. An example of such a practices is the famous *Oratio* from 1492, given at the gymnasium of Ingolstadt by German arch-humanist Konrad Celtis (who apart from many other things, played significant role in the development of humanism in Central Europe and was actually one of the founders of Polish humanism<sup>118</sup>), in which he called for a revival of humanist practices among the Germans. But Celtis *Oratio* also possessed serious political connotations. It supported an imperial policy, spoke against the abuses of papal and episcopal authority for worldly ends, and finally issued a warning:

O free and powerful people, O noble and valiant race, plainly worthy of the Roman Empire, our famous harbor is held by the *Sarmatian* (!), and the Gateway of our ocean by the *Dacian*! In the east also powerful peoples live in slavery, the *Marcomani*, the *Quadi*, the *Bastranae*, and the *Peicini* who all live as it were separated from the body of our Germany.<sup>119</sup>

As Kenneth Schellhase suggests, here under the ancient names are skillfully hidden the names of the Poles, Danes, Bohemians, Prussians, Sliesians, etc. What we see here is actually a call to (free) put under the imperial rule, all "German tribes" of the east, separated from the main German body and living in slavery. Thus Celtis declared the Bohemians, Prussians, Sliesians and others as Germans, and so

<sup>118</sup>For influence of Konrad Celtis on development of Polish humanism see Harold B. Segel, *Renaissance Culture in Poland: The Rise of Humanism 1470-1543* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989) pp.83-106.

<sup>119</sup>O liberum et robustum populum, o nobilem et fortem gentem et plane dignam Romano imperio, cuius inclitum maris portum et claustra Oceani nostri Sarmata et Dacus possident! Ab oriente autem valentissimae gentes serviunt, Marcomanni, Quadi, Bastarnae et Peucini et quasi a corpore Germaniae nostrae separate vivunt. Cited from Kenneth Schellhase C., *Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought* (Chicago and London: 1976) p. 35.

effectively put history in the service of the "reason of the state."

The attacks from the opposing side backed by authority of works of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini,<sup>120</sup> who was not favorably inclined towards the Slavs, had to be countered by equally effective arguments by Polish humanists. So the questions concerning the origin of the Slavs (and thus the Poles), etymology of their name, autochtony of the Slavs in their lands and thus their historical and natural rights, represented a weapon in the political debates of the time. But, to complete the link, one more issue had to be accounted for, namely the contacts of Polish and Croatian humanists.

Jagellon University of Cracow, founded by Casimir the Great in 1364, by the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century established itself as a first class European humanistic center. Throughout the 16<sup>th</sup> century, many Croatian humanists, either as visitors, students, or diplomatic envoys of the Hungarian kings, resided in Cracow.<sup>121</sup> One of those visitors from the south was Vinko Pribojević, who, as he states in his oration, spent three years among the Poles.<sup>122</sup> During his stay, Pribojević was the guest of another Dalmatian, who found his new home in Poland, Bernardin Galla<sup>123</sup> from Zara a high official in the Cracow church hierarchy. Joanna Rapacka, in her article concerning the contacts of Croatian and Polish humanists, points out that the majority of the historical problems of interest to Polish humanists, namely those of etymology of the Slav name from the word glory – "slava" instead from "sclavus," and the question of autochtony and their origin forms the ideological foundations of Vinko Pribojević's oration.<sup>124</sup> Thus, it can safely be concluded that Pribojević was well informed about Polish historiography: among his sources are the *Annales Polonorum*<sup>125</sup> and he extensively quotes Maciej Miechowita's *De Duabus Sarmatiis, Asiana et Europeana*, which served as a main source for his description of contemporary Eastern Europe.

---

120For influence of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini on German Renaissance historiography, with special emphasis on development of so-called myth of *Imperium*, see Frank Borchardt, pp. 53 -56.

121For more on Croatian – Polish contacts in 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century see: Joanna Rapacka, "O nekim problemima iz povijesti odnosa hrvatskih humanista s Poljskom i Poljacima" (Concernig some problems from history of relations between Croatian humanists and Poland and Poles) *Dani hvarskog kazališta, Hrvatski humanizam – Janus Panonius*, vol. 16 (1990): pp. 168 – 175.

122Pribojević, 1997, p. 70.

123For more about Bernardin Galla see *Jan Krzemieniecki, Bernardinus Galleus de Jadera, vicarius et officialis generalis cracoviensis 1509-1517* (Cracoviae, 1934)

124During preparations for Church Lateran Council (1512-1517), Jan Laski *Primas* of the Polish kingdom, contacted Bernardo Galla and requestd his historical expertise. A letter from Laski to Galla besides Polish issues deals with some all-Slavic questions. Such as, etymology of the Slav name from the word Glory – *Slava* instead from "sclavus", and in confirmation of that theory lists names of the Slavic rulers ending on "-slaus" such as "Stanislaum, Vinceslaum, Ladislaum, Ceslaum, Bogoslaum, Marislaum..." which Pribojević brings in his text word-by-word, and the question of their origin. Based on this list of names and use of the same etymology for the Slav name Rapacka argues that Pribojević was familiar with the contest of the letter. Joanna Rapacka, pp. 171-175.; Pribojević, 1997, p. 66.

125This vague Pribojević's reference to the *Annales Polonorum* I think should be associated with Jan Dlugosz' work. First argument in favor of this association is the sole importance and influence of Dlugosz's work which although remained unpublished until 1614 was widely available in manuscript. Furthermore, the reference to *Annaless Polonorum* appears in Pribojević only once, in connection with the Legend of the three brothers Czech, Lech and Rhus, and the variant of the Legend can be found in the Dlugosz. Therefore I think it safe to assume that Pribojević's *Annales Polonorum* referes to Dlugosz's work. Pribojević, 1997, p. 64.

So what were the options available to Pribojević, for his choice of myth of origin, if he decided to follow the line of northern Slavic historians? The majority of medieval Polish chronicles, such as that of Bishop Boguchwał, only mention descent of *Pannoni* from Jan, a descendant of Japhet.<sup>126</sup> By the second half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the story became more elaborate. One of the most influential and well known historiographical works of Polish Renaissance was Jan Długosz's (1415-1480) history of Poland, *Annales seu cronica incliti regni Poloniae*. Canon Jan Długosz, later Archbishop of Lwow, followed the line of Renaissance historians who in their myth of origin, opted for the sons of Japhet not found in the book of Genesis. Thus Długosz constructed a very detailed genealogy that included the majority of modern European nations (also not found in Genesis), such as the Franks, Romans, Britons, Goths, Burgundians, Vandals, Saxons, Bohemians, etc., all stemming from Alanus, son of Japhet, and his three sons Isicon, Armenon and Negnon.<sup>127</sup>

In 1517, Maciej Miechowita published his first major work, *Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis*. The work was quite popular, and Pribojević most probably became acquainted with it during his stay in Poland. Indeed, it became his main source for description of distant north and eastern Slavic lands. Concerning the origin of the Slavs, Maciej Miechowita made an interesting choice, and suggested that the Slavs were descendants of Javan, the fourth son of Japhet, and thus relatives of the Greeks of whom Javan is traditionally held as their forefather.<sup>128</sup>

This completes the sketch of the intellectual background for Pribojević's narrative. Throughout this overview of the biblical myths of origins found within the three historiographical traditions that made major influence on Pribojević final choice, I have provided the context from which his work emerged.

### 2.3. Genesis

Of the seven sons of Japhet, four were easily ruled out because of their connection to nations geographically too far away to have any connection to the Slavs, such as the Iberians, Capadocians and Meds, or otherwise unlinkable to the Slavs as was the case with the Gomer-Gaul combination. The fifth possible choice, that of Magog, as was already stated, although not without roots in medieval historiographical tradition was unacceptable to Pribojević because he did want to count the Goths among the Slavs, but did not wish them to be the root from which Slavic tree sprang forth, but rather to be only one branch of it. This narrowed choice to only two brothers: Thyras and Javan.

But Thyras, the seventh son of Japhet, (as it is obvious from what I have said) was the forefather of Thracians, and from him stemmed that people which is nowadays known under the name of Slavs.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup>Boguchwał, p. 468.

<sup>127</sup>His story of beginnings of mankind, Długosz begins with the traditional narrative found in the books of Genesis and Joseph Flavius, but then provides his reader with this additional genealogy of the European nations. See Ioannis Dlugossii, *Annales seu cronicae incliti regni Poloniae*, vol. I. (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964) pp. 67-70. (Henceforth Długosz, *Annales*)

<sup>128</sup>Maciej Miechowita, *Tractatus de duabus sarmatiis, Asiana et Europiana*. (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1936) p. 152.

<sup>129</sup>Ast Thyras, septimus inter filios Iaphet, (ut ex his, quae diximus, est manifestum) Thracii generis initium fuit ab ipsoque universa, quae nunc Slavorum nomine censetur, cognatio egressa est.

Pribojević's final choice fell on Thyras, the youngest of the sons of Japhet. Thyras was the father of the Thracians, a long forgotten people who lived in the regions today inhabited by the Slavs. At first glance this choice does not seem as the most promising, but a closer investigation of Pribojević's final result reveals not only Pribojević's creativity in compiling various ancient authors, but also the fruitfulness of this choice.

As Alois Schmaus<sup>130</sup> noted in his analysis of Pribojević's work, the decision not to follow the choice of Maciej Miechowita, and the claimed descent of the Slavs from Javan, was purely a pragmatic decision. It did not fit into Pribojević's overall scheme, especially concerning the Macedonian question. Of which more will be said in the following sections.

The next step was to declare the Slavic name as a new one, used today as a common name for a variety of nations who in the past possessed many names.

The descendants of Thyras, who once had twelve names, recently in our time are designated by a new unique name, of which the author is unknown, derived from the word "slava" (glory). And so those who once were differentiated by various names now are called the Slavs, that is glorious, from the word "slava", meaning glory, which holds the same meaning in all of those *nationes*.<sup>131</sup>

In this way, Pribojević was able to use all associations of the Slavs with another nations, such as the Vandals, Goths, Gepids and Macedonians. Furthermore the Gothic invasion mentioned in *Historia Salonitana* and the Chronicle of Dioclean Priest, was not any more a problem. They simply meant that certain descendants of Thyras had a war with other descendants of the same forefather. What remains to be seen is the kaleidoscopic image produced by Pribojević's rearrangement of elements.

### **3. The Glory of the Slavs – Pribojević's Pan-Slavic version of the history**

#### **3.1. A Stolen History**

Do not be afraid by the diversity of the names, due to the vastness of the lands inhabited by the descendants of Thyras, it was unavoidable for them to be named differently. Under their rule are, not to mention the old names of the regions, *Ruscia, Cassubia, Pruscia, Masouia, Vandalia, Moscouia, Polonia, Slesia, Morauia, Bohemia, Panonia, Carniola, Hystria, Lyburnia, Croatia, Dalmatia, Bosna, Rascia, Dardania, Seuria, Myssia* and *Bulgaria* once called *Macedonia*.<sup>132</sup>

---

Pribojević, 1997, p. 58.

<sup>130</sup>Alois Schmaus, "Vincentius Priboevius, ein Vorläufer des Panslavismus," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 3 (Munich: 1953) pp. 243-254.

<sup>131</sup>Duodecim igitur nominibus Thyrae olim posteritas nuncupata, nostra hac tempestate unico recentiori uocabulo, ex gloria deriuato, ignoto auctore insignitur, sic quod, qui prius uarietate cognominum differebant, a Slaua, quod apud omnes has nationes gloriam significat, Slauum quasi gloriosi dicuntur. Pribojević, 1997, p. 66.

<sup>132</sup>Nec te nominum uarietas exterrere, quoniam pro locorum, quae Thyrae posteritas obtinuit, amplitudine necesse fuit uariis eos appellationibus recenseri. Nam eorum iuris, ut antiqua prouintiarum cognomina omittam, fuit Ruscia, Cassubia, Pruscia, Masouia, Vandalia, Moscouia, Polonia, Slesia, Morauia, Bohemia, Panonia, Carniola, Hystria, Lyburnia, Croatia,



After establishing Thyras at the root of his genealogical tree, Pribojević embarks on the complicated task of connecting other nations to the Thracians. He does this through a highly subjective and uncritical compilation of statements of various ancient authors. This line of argumentation, which seeks to establish the connection between other ancient nations and Thracians, is interesting because it clearly illustrates Pribojević's methodological position. Therefore it will be shortly addressed here.

First Pribojević claims, relying on Strabon, that the Thracians use the same language as Mysians. Second, according to Appian from Alexandria, the Myssians are considered to be Illyrians, and that is why the Romans considered the Thracian and Illyrian language as one and the same. Furthermore the "Gets who are later called the Goths" (according to Isidore of Seville, St. Antonin etc.), use the same language as the Dacians and Myssians, as confirmed by Strabon again. From here Pribojević draws the obvious conclusion: the Myssians, Illyrians, Dacians and Gets are all descendants of the Thracians, and thus of Thyras, son of Japhet son of Noah.<sup>133</sup>

From here, Pribojević, continues to use similar arguments (analysis of which is subject of next chapter), and thus adding many others to the list of Slavic peoples: the Macedonians, Istrians and Vandals, completes his long lists of ancient nations he declared Slavs.

After successfully creating such a pseudo-historical framework, Pribojević unfolds his narrative and presents to his readers the glorious deeds of the Slavs. Things set as they were, made Pribojević's job an easy one. He does not have a problem with the lack of sources or materials, now, at his hand are the masterpieces of classical literature and historiography. Where once was emptiness and silence, now hundreds of voices shouted.

For information on the Illyrians and Thracians, Pribojević could chose from Pliny, Polibius, Strabo, Appian, Lucius Flor and many more, for the Goths and Vandals at his disposal were Isidore of Seville, Paulus Orosius and Jordanes. Furthermore, *Quintus Curtius Rufus* provided him with an excellent materials for Alexander of Macedonia. He also used the latest achievements of humanistic historiography, the most cited author in Pribojević's *Oratio* is his Venetian contemporary, Marco Antonio Coccio, known as Sabellico. With such a vast quantity of materials at his disposal, there was (almost)<sup>134</sup> no need for him, to invent and falsify data.

According to Hvar Dominican, it was the Slavs who conquered Persia, Africa and Hispania, sacked Rome and gave to the world such learned men as Aristotle and St. Jerome, or powerful monarchs such as Alexander or Diocletian. In front of his audience, rescued from oblivion emerged a glorious history of Slavhood, its numerous heroes, saints, popes, king and emperors<sup>135</sup> resurrected parade in their full

---

Dalmatia, Bosna, Rascia, Dardania, Seuria, Myssia et Bulgaria, quae olim Macedonia dicebatur. Pribojević, 1997, pp. 59-60.

<sup>133</sup>Pribojević. 1997, pp. 57-58.

<sup>134</sup>Nevertheless Grga Novak in his study managed to point out to the several cases of Pribojević's 'banding' the truth, putting words in others mouth and misquoting, and on few occasions even inventing entire sentences. See Grga Novak, 1951, pp. 27-35.

<sup>135</sup>The long list of Roman emperors Pribojević considers Slavs contains 23 entries, plus two emperors of the Holy Roman Empire. Pribojević, 1997, p. 70.

glory and greatness; the worthy sons of *populus Slavus*. Let us give Pribojević the closing words in this short summary of his narrative:

Who can bestow high enough praise to the Slavs to reflect their glory? With their bravery they had humbled the arrogant Persians, weakened the mighty Assyrians and Medes, overthrown the famed Egyptians, defeated the brave Greeks, conquered the indomitable Scythians, overcome the numerous Indians, overpowered the strong Germans, defeated dexterous Hispanians, tamed the savage Gauls, emasculated the proud Romans, and annihilated the sly Carthagians!<sup>136</sup> Thus I have done according to my abilities, but, by far not enough as the dignity of the Slavs demands.<sup>137</sup>

The final result was an impressive one, not only because Pribojević managed to include in his construction, all the peoples of antiquity (and their histories) who lived in the lands presently inhabited by the Slavs (plus few more, like wandering Goths and Vandals), but also managed to support it by a consistent theory.

---

<sup>136</sup>The English translation taken from Zdenko Zlatar, *The Double Eagle and the Crescent* (New York: East European Monographs, 1992) p. 59.

<sup>137</sup>Quis igitur mortalium dignis ualet Slauorum gloria laudibus extollere, quorum uirtute depressa est Persarum arrogantia, eneruata, Asyriourum et Medorum potentia, deiecta Aegyptiourum extollentia, debellata Graecorum prestantia, subacta Schitarum immanitas, oppressa Indorum multitudo, superata Germanorum asperitas, deuicta Hispanorum dexteritas, prostrata Gallolorum ferocitas, inclinata Romanorum sublimitas, deleta Penorum caliditas. Pribojević, 1997, p.75.

## Chapter III: Illyria the World of Myth

### 1. Proto-national Elements in Pribojević's Oration

As a typical work of renaissance historiography (see previous chapter), Pribojević's *Oratio* is by its nature far from being a work with a clear program of national identity building in the 19<sup>th</sup> century sense of the term. Nevertheless, it deals with the history of the *patria*. The issues it addresses are all closely related to the question of identity. What more concerns identity of a community than the memories of its past, its beliefs, myths and legends, all of which are focal points of *Oratio*.

Therefore, *Oratio* can serve as excellent research material concerning both the author's personal understanding of his self-identity and the current state in the process of formation of a larger collective identity of the authors' community. Various levels of identity and self-representation found their place both in the intentional and unintentional messages built into the fabric of the Pribojević's narrative. The goal of this chapter is to examine what, according to Pribojević, constitutes a collective identity, what makes one group of people a community, different and separated from the others.

Although the terms "people," "ethnicity," "race," and "ethnogenesis," as pointed out by Patrick Geary in his *Myth of nations*, carry no "objective, fixed meaning" and possess history of their own, being "burdened with the cultural baggage of the past," there is "no use trying to invent new terms for past social groups."<sup>138</sup>

Anthony D. Smith, a leading exponent of the ethno-symbolism tradition in the field of research of the history of the nations, places great importance on the investigation of pre-modern identities in the process of the evolution of a nation. His emphasis is on ethnic consciousness, found in a complex of myths and symbols.<sup>139</sup> For Smith, the core object of such research is *ethnie*, which he defines as "a named human population with myths of common ancestry, shared historical memories and one or more elements of common culture, including an association with a homeland, and some degree of solidarity."<sup>140</sup> The term used here, ethnicity, thus designates a certain stage in process of development of collective identity among one group of people.

The terms used by Pribojević are *gens*, *natio* and *genus*. The opening sentence of the oration reveals the image of humanity as being divided into races: "Confusa sunt omnia hominum genera, et proplexa est originum series..."<sup>141</sup> In the texts Slavs are referred to as *gens*, *natio* and *genus*. It seems that there are no fixed relations, or a clearly defined hierarchy among this three notions in Pribojević's work. They are basically used as synonyms.

The next section analyses both the methods and arguments which Pribojević uses in his work, and his understanding of what constitutes a community. The subsequent sections deals with the factors that theories of ethnicity consider to play a major role in the subjective identification of the individual with the community, such as territory, a sense of solidarity or myth of common origin, and are not specifically

<sup>138</sup>Patrick Geary, *Myth of the nations*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>139</sup>Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnic origins of Nations*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988) pp. 21-31.

<sup>140</sup>Anthony Smith, *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, p.13.

<sup>141</sup>Pribojević, 1997, p. 55.

identified by Pribojević as such, but are nevertheless present in his work.

## **2. Pribojević's Concept of Collective Identity or What Makes Slavs Slavs?**

As mentioned in the previous chapter, based on myth of the origin, Pribojević built a glorious history of the Slavs. The great history is made of great men. This brings to our attention to an untouched problem, the question of a criteria, the mechanism used by Pribojević to recognize various individuals or groups as Slavs, and thus make them fitting for incorporation into his narrative.

The criteria applied by Pribojević are not social or religious. Thracians, Macedonians and Illyrians in the service of the Grand Turk are still Slavs, no matter what religion they confess:

So there is no reason for anyone to be *puzzled* that Ottoman Sultan put so much praise in people of Slavic origin, that almost all of his commanders are appointed from their ranks, and that he maintains the corps, almost 20,000 strong for his personal guard composed of Thracians, Macedonians and Illyrians.<sup>142</sup>

Experience has shown, especially in this unfortunate times of ours, that Ottoman heirs, by the use of Slavic troops overcame kingdoms, obtained empires, took over strongly fortified cities and with all forces press to ruin the roman empire, and if the hand of the God almighty do not assist us, they will destroy the true faith.<sup>143</sup>

Neither is Slavhood for Pribojević a social category, since it includes both the Roman emperors of Illyrian origins and peasants from Hvar. So what, in the eyes of Pribojević, determines someone as belonging to the *populus slaus*?

Three main arguments are repeatedly used by Pribojević when advocating someones Slav identity: descent, language and customs. Indeed, he is systematic and consistent in the application of this criteria, but also rather subjective. In the following paragraphs through several case studies, the practical application of those criteria through Pribojević's argumentation, are illustrated.

### **1.1. Descent and Customs**

The previous chapter explored the question of descent, namely how and why Pribojević chose the myth of origin for the Slavs, and how from it did he construct his grand history. The genealogical schema Pribojević adopted was a simple one. There are no parallel branches of descent for the Slavs, like in the Germans-Goths

<sup>142</sup>Here Pribojević refers to the Janissary corps, at that time filled exclusively by *devrisime* or the 'blood tribute' from the Slavic population of the Balkan peninsula. Taken from their families, young boys were then put under strict order and raised to be professional servants of the Ottoman state both in military as in civil branch of government.

<sup>143</sup>Quamobrem nulli mirum uideri debet tanti uiros Slaui generis a Principe turarum duci, ut fere omnes sui exercitus praefectos ex eis statuat phalangemque uiginti millium fere uirorum ad suae salutis tutelam ex Thracibus as Macedonibus Illyriisque decernat.

Experientia enim compertum est, his praecipue infelicissimis nostris temporibus, Othomani posteritatem Slaui aciae regna superare, imperia obtinere, munitissimas urbes expugnare, euertendo Romano imperio incumbere orthodoxamque religionem, nisi omnipotentis dei manus suoetias attulerit, destruere et pessundare. Pribojević, 1997, p. 73

case, or several fathers for Slavic branches as suggested by Dlugosz's elaborate genealogy. The Slavic genealogy stems of one root (Thyras) from which all the branches of the Slavic tree sprang forth.

Even this starting position of Pribojević needed to be defended, because of the common association of the Thracians and Greeks, found in the writings of many ancient and medieval authors, such as St. Isidore, St. Antonin, Philip of Bergam, all of whom Pribojević declared mistaken and misled, "probably deceived by the proximity of those lands."<sup>144</sup> But what Pribojević does not allow for the Slavs, he also does not allow for the others: in his image of the world every *gens* has only one forefather. And since, argues Pribojević, the Thracians descended from Thyras, while the forefather of the Greeks, as "everyone knows" is Javan, they (Thracians) can not be Greeks.<sup>145</sup> This line of argument is further strengthened by the claim of differences in customs, ways of armaments and interests between the Thracians and Greeks, all "by the book", supported by quotes from Lucius Florus and Appian of Alexandria.

Even from this simple case, one can already see the roles and weight of particular arguments employed by Pribojević in his polemics. Although rarely used as a main argument, descent was of the utmost importance, and so far neglected by historians studying Pribojević. The descent defined the line that could not be crossed; the offsprings of sons of Japhet were strictly divided, and no mapping of one contemporary nation to several forefathers was permitted or possible. On the other hand, the differences or similarities in customs is mainly used as a minor argument, one under which many things could be placed, ranging from ways of armament to dress and hair styles. However, the argument with the most weight and one that surpasses all the others is the language criterion.

### 1.2. Language as *Differentia specifica*

Language is an unavoidable element of almost all of Pribojević's argumentation. As shown in chapter two, Pribojević after declaring Thyras as a father of the Slavs, immediately applied language as a connecting criteria. The link that connects Illyrians, Myssians, Dacians and Goths to the Thracians is built solely on records claiming the usage of a common language by all of these nations.<sup>146</sup>

A full discussion concerning the name and the nature of the common language, follows in the sections below. For now, I only wish to mention that Pribojević designates that common language as Slavic. He states that there exists the unity of language among the descendants Thyras, and later in his argumentation in favor of Slavic ethnicity of Macedonians and Istrians claims that they speak Slavic. Apart from this, he states that the Russians are also using *Dalmatarum sermone*.<sup>147</sup> Through this language unity, Pribojević claims a continuity of the present inhabitants of Balkan peninsula with those from Antiquity.

The case of the kinship among the Dacians, Illyrians and Goths is of lesser importance, because it was less likely to be disputed. Therefore Pribojević wastes little space for a further elaboration of this unity: several short quotes by a few

---

<sup>144</sup>Pribojević, 1997, p. 58.

<sup>145</sup>Pribojević, 1997, p. 58.

<sup>146</sup>Pribojević. 1997, pp. 57-58.

<sup>147</sup>Pribojević, 1997, p. 62.

ancient authorities were sufficient. But the claim on the Slavic character of two other ethnic groups, those of the 16<sup>th</sup> century Macedonians and Istrians, both not ancient but rather contemporary, associated with real and disputable territories and claims on their historical heritage, required more elaborate and sound argumentation. The argumentation employed by Pribojević in these two cases, to prove the Slav ethnic identity of the Macedonians and Istrians provide us with an excellent case study in application of his identifying mechanism.

### 1.2.1. Macedonian question

To prove the Slavic character of the Macedonians, Pribojević's first step was to prove that their language is not same as that of the Greeks. To achieve this, he used an anecdote found in *History of Alexander the Great* by *Quintus Curtius Rufus*. According to the story told by Rufus (and retold by Pribojević), when Philotas son of Parmenio was put on trial in front of the Macedonian army (large part of which were the Greeks), Alexander asked him, "Philotas, the Macedonians are going to judge you, state whether you will use your mother-tongue in front of them." Philotas answered that he will not, because not everyone will be able to understand him, which provoked Alexander to respond, that Philotas hates his mother-tongue.<sup>148</sup>

The conclusion Pribojević draws from this short story is that Philotas decided not to speak his native language (Macedonian) in front of the army because it was a different one from the common language of the entire army (Greek). Since the Macedonians and Greeks did not speak the same language, they can not be considered the same people. So Hvar Dominican argues:

it has become the custom of old, that the unity of the descent is proved by unity of the speech, and thus we consider as the members of the same kin, only those who have in tender age together with the mothers milk, also mothers-tongue received.<sup>149</sup>

This, for him proves that the Macedonians have always, as today, spoke only the Slavic language, and are therefore Slavs.

### 1.2.2. Istrian Question

The argumentation used by Pribojević for the Istrians also relies on the language as its main point. But this time argumentation was not as clear and simple as in the case of the Macedonians. The main point of Pribojević's claim lay in the fact that the inhabitants of Goritza and Trieste (the parts enclosing Istria to the north-west), "like all other Istrans" for their internal communication, use only the Slavic language. However, he is forced to admit the existence of bilingual speakers among the Istrians, but also among the Dalmatians, which he explains by the proximity, and frequent contacts with the Italians. Hence his laconic conclusion of the topic, stating that "some Istrians especially those living on the coast, same as the Dalmatians do,

---

<sup>148</sup>Pribojević, 1997, pp.60-61.

<sup>149</sup>Free translation of the following passage from Pribojević:

..., quum ex antiqua sermonis unitate generis unitas abunde soleat demonstrari eosque eiusdem generis esse opinemur, quibus a teneris unguiculis simul cum materno ubere loquellae commercium concessum est. Pribojević, 1997, p.61.

speak Italian when they wish to."<sup>150</sup>

Interestingly enough, what magister of theology is not ready to allow in the question of descent, namely multiple lines of descent for various *gentes*, he is ready to compromise on the question of language, allowing bilingualism for the Dalmatians and Istrians. In other words, although a *gens* is defined primarily through language, it is possible that members of one *gens* may use two or even more languages, without bringing into question its distinctiveness and their collective identity.

This main line of argument is further strengthened with quotes from Appian's *De bello Illyrico*, mentioning *Histros, Illyriorum nationem*.<sup>151</sup> In short, we again encounter the same methodology already applied by Pribojević in the Macedonian case, now only changed in the content of his arguments, and unfortunately for Pribojević lacking an amusing anecdote from a classical author.

But the question of Istrian membership among *nationes Illircii* has another dimension. It was a question of importance for contemporary Croatian/Dalmatian humanists, not because of some expansionist territorial claims, but rather because of its cultural heritage, namely its connection to the person of St. Jerome.<sup>152</sup>

### 1.2.3 Ethnicity of the saint

I can not stop being amazed at how, competing with us, Biondo of Forli, Filip of Bergamo and some others, so that they could take away from us and number among theirs St. Jerome, claim that Istria is an Italian land although it is with its location, with its customs and with its language separated from Italy...<sup>153</sup>

The claim of an Illyrian character to Istria in opposition to an Italian one, is directly connected with the claim on the person and authority of St. Jerome. At the core of debate is the town of Stridon, the birth place of St. Jerome. The question of where this town is located (destroyed by the Goths in the fifth century), is one that was object of discussion among Italian and Dalmatian humanists. According to Philip of Bergam and Biondo of Friuli, the town of Stridon should be identified with the small town of *Strigna*, that lies west of Kopar, in the western part of Istria. Furthermore since, according to Strabo, "the Roman emperors have declared the town of Pula to

---

<sup>150</sup>Pribojević, 1997, p. 62.

<sup>151</sup>Maybe it is of no importance and could prove no direct point, but interesting is to note, that what magister of theology is not ready to allow in the question of descent, namely multiple lines of descent for various *gentes*, he is ready to compromise in the question of the language, and allow binlinguallity for the Dalmatians and Istrians. In other words although a *gens* is defined primarily through langugae it is possible that members of one gens use two or even more languages.

<sup>152</sup>Here Pribojević joins an already ongoing dispute among the Dalmatian and Italian Humanists concerning the "ownership" of the St. Jerome. The first among Dalmatian humansits to write on this question was Juraj Šižgorić in his *De situ*, later he is followed by Marko Marulić in his *Animadversio in eos qui beatum Hieronymum Italum esse contendunt*, on which Pribojević is refering, although the work remained in manuscript until 1666 when famous Croatian historian *Lucius* published it.

<sup>153</sup> mirari satis nequeo Foroliuiensis ac Philippi Bergomatis necnon et quorundam aliorum, ut peritissimum a nobis auferre suisque connumerare diuum possint Hieronymium, Histriam Italie esse prouinciam astruentium erga nos aemulationem, cum situ ac moribus et sermone Histria ab Italīs distinguatur omnesque circum adiacentes populi Histria Italiae intimiores,... Pribojević, 1997, p. 62.

be western border of Italy,"<sup>154</sup> St. Jerome was to be considered as an Italian. This hypothesis was challenged by Dalmatian humanists, who on the other hand, claimed that Stridon, hometown of St. Jerome is on the border of Pannonia and Dalmatia, as St. Jerome himself stated,<sup>155</sup> and not in Istria. Therefore St. Jerome is to be considered as Dalmatian, and not Italian.

For Dalmatian/Croatian, humanists a claim on St. Jerome was more than the claim on just another saint, one more to be counted among the ranks of venerable ancestors. The first reason for this obviously lies in the esteem that St. Jerome, author of the standard Latin translation of the Bible, and most learned of the Saints, enjoyed among the humanists. If the list of the learned and famous Dalmatians was not a long one, at least it started with the St. Jerome.

That is why the Dalmatian Dominican, Pribojević, does not allow for St. Jerome to be *taken away from us and numbered among theirs*.<sup>156</sup> For him, "there is no doubt that St. Jerome, who was born in the town of *Stridon* on the border of Dalmatia and Pannonia, was not an Italian but rather a Dalmatian (Slav)."<sup>157</sup> Furthermore, it is also interesting to note that the space dedicated to St. Jerome is almost twice as large as his argument in defense of the Slavic character of Istria. Moreover, it maybe be plausible to assume that in the eyes of Pribojević (and possibly others) it is the person of St. Jerome that does the intellectual mapping of Istria into the Slavic world, and not the other way.

But there is also another issue, connected to St. Jerome worth noting here. One mentioned by Pribojević, but it seems as if of lesser importance to him, because he does not place much emphasis on it. Parts of Istria, Kvarner and the hinterland of the northwestern coast, were since the Middle Ages, counted among the strongholds of a specific Slavic liturgy, one based on the Latin rite and usage of Glagolitic letters.<sup>158</sup> This tradition, at the same time Slavic and Catholic, as opposed to Slavic-Orthodox tradition,<sup>159</sup> on the verge of being declared schismatic or even heresy, was

---

<sup>154</sup>Pribojević, 1997, 63.

<sup>155</sup>St. Jerome mentions this in *De viris illustribus*, in the following passage: "Hieronymus, patre Eusebio natus, oppido Stridonis, quod a Gothis eursum Dalmatiae quondam Pannoniaeque confinium fuit." Pribojević, 1997, p.109.

<sup>156</sup>Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff in her article noted two things. First the linguistic similarity of this Pribojević's passage and one found in Šižgorić's *De situ*, and second the similarity of used arguments. All of this implies that Pribojević probably took over this entire argumentation from Šižgorić, and further developed it. In Šižgorić this sentence goes as: *quem Itali preasertim Illyriis auferr conantur*, Šižgorić, *De Situ*, p. 24; Giovanna Broggi-Bercoff, *Il Priboeovo*, p. 145.; Pribojević, 1997, p. 62, 80.

<sup>157</sup>Pribojević, 1997, 63.

<sup>158</sup>In the 13<sup>th</sup> century after almost three centuries of struggle, the papacy finally reluctantly acknowledged the *status quo* and allowed the usage of Slavice rite and glagolitic alphabet in liturgy, but limited it spatially to the mentioned areas. Another important center of glagolitic literature was Prague, where since 14<sup>th</sup> century, founded at the call from Charles IV<sup>th</sup> of Luxemburg, a mission of glagolitic-Benedictines was active in the monastery 'Na Slovanech'. For more on glagolitic vernacular literature in medieval Dalmatia and Croatia see Marin Franičević, pp. 62-88.; and very detailed overview in Eduard Hercigonja, *Tropismena i trojezična kultura hrvatskog srednjovjekovlja* (Three alphabet - three language Culture of the Croatian Middle Ages) (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1994) pp.49-86.

<sup>159</sup>In the Pribojević's world history, one thing is strikingly missing, and that is the Byzantine Empire and its influence on the Slavs and their cultural development. Cyril is only once mentioned as the author of the alphabet used by inhabitants of Muscovite state. There is no mention of Slavic Orthodox inhabitants of Balkan peninsula and of their not so long ago promising empires, such as



by its advocates defended by the authority of St. Jerome. He was allegedly the author of the glagolitic letters, also known as "*scriptura hieronymitana*," or Croatian letters. Furthermore it was St. Jerome who translated into Slavic, church liturgical books used in those parts.<sup>160</sup> As was said previously, this long tradition of writing in Glagolitic alphabet was one of the roots from which Croatian Renaissance vernacular literature sprang forth.

### 1.3. Inquiry in the Origins of Language Criterion

The quest for the roots of Pribojević's understanding of identity as one based on linguistic community leads back to the Bible, with its myth of common descent of mankind from Adam, and the story of the Tower of Babel when the various languages were distributed and accordingly mankind divided.

When God saw that they acted so madly, he did not resolve to destroy them utterly, since they were not grown wiser by the destruction of the former sinners; but he caused a tumult among them, by producing in them diverse languages, and causing that, through the multitude of those languages, they should not be able to understand one another.<sup>161</sup>

As Robert Bartlett in his "*Making of Europe*" argues, for medieval ecclesiastics and scholars, this was the first step in the formation of races or peoples.<sup>162</sup> Their belief was backed by St. Isidore's claim that "peoples have originated from languages, not languages from peoples."<sup>163</sup> Although, as Walter Pohl argues, it was hardly possible that St. Isidore considered language as a practical differentiating criterion,<sup>164</sup> it nevertheless entered medieval tradition.

Further influences on Pribojević came from his historical context. The identification of the tongue with the *nation*, was one familiar among all Slavic nations already in the late Middle Ages.<sup>165</sup> Examples of such usages could be found among Czech chronicles, where *jazyk cesky* meant both tongue and people, and also the Poles, both maintaining frequent cultural contacts with the Croats, but also among the Russians, where *yazyk* held the same meaning.

The same identification of tongue and people was also present among the Croats, whose vernacular literature contains numerous examples of such associations.

---

that of Serbs or Bulgarians, or even of Byzantine rule over the Dalmatian towns up until the 12<sup>th</sup> century. See Pribojević, 1997, *passim*.

160Georgius de Sclavonia (? - 1416), one of early Croatian humanist, student and later professor at Sorbonne University, left collection of writings on Glagolitic letters, which he called *alphabetum chrawaticum*. Eduard Hercigonja, p. 73.

161Joseph Flavius, *Jewish antiquities*, 1.4.3.

162Robert Bartlett, "Language and Ethnicity in Medieval Europe," in *Ethnicity*, ed. John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith D. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) p. 128. (henceforth Robert Bartlett, *Language and Ethnicity*)

163ex linguis gentes, non ex gentibus linguae exortae sunt. Taken from Walter Pohl, *Telling the Difference*, pp. 17-18.

164Pohl bases his arguments on fact that in the Roman Empire which Isidore considered not as a single Roman *gens*, but rather as a collection of *gentes* and *nationes*, Latin and Greek as shared languages enabled unailing communication. Furthermore argues Pohl, the choice of language as a criterion for ethnicity could look like a logical choice to St. Isidore in case of barbaric *gentes*, where variety of languages really impeded communication. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

165Robert Bartlett, *Language and Ethnicity*, pp. 128-132.

Probably the most famous of such examples among Croatian historians is *Pop Martinac* (priest Martinac), who left his record of the catastrophic defeat of the Croat army at Krbava in 1493, noting that afterward the Turks "pressed hard on the Croat tongue."<sup>166</sup>

The other example of such usage is an older work, the already mentioned Croatian redaction of LJPD.<sup>167</sup> The Croatian edition contains the story, not a part of the original chronicle, of King Zvonimir, the last king of independent early medieval Croatian Kingdom. The story claims that when the king in front of general assembly of the kingdom, issued a call for the Croats to join the First Crusade, the untrustworthy Croats killed him. But before he died, the king pronounced a curse on them, stating that "they shall never again have a lord of their own tongue."<sup>168</sup> The chronicler later continues, and compares the damned Croats to the Jews, who have also killed their lord, and since then "they serve the others, and never have a lord of their own tongue."<sup>169</sup>

From the above, one can safely assume that Pribojević most probably took an understanding of his surrounding and transformed it into a scholarly supported argumentation, expanded by usage of descent and customs.

What gave such weight to language as the main argument? Of the three factors used by Pribojević, descent is the most scholarly one; its implication and visibility in everyday life are almost nonexistent; at first sight the stranger will hardly reveal his descent from different biblical forefather of the Japhet branch, and thus his belonging to the other community. On the other hand, the customs of the other might be visible; different clothing, habits, way of armament all are easily spotted. However, customs could hardly be a factor that can be used as a main differentiating criteria, one on which to build a sense of belonging to the particular community, because of it is too wide margins. Customs are too easily influenced by factors such as geography, urban or rural environment and social status. Customs of, say, Venetian fishermen are almost the same as of Dalmatian, but both are quite different from shepherds or peasants from the Dalmatian hinterland. The main strength of the language criterion lies in its 'empirical' testability, and as we have seen its rootedness in everyday life and historical traditions. A language community is one of the easiest to define and whose membership is also one of the easiest to test.

## **2. Dalmatian, Illyrian or a Slav?**

The first key element in identifying an *ethnie* is the possession of a common name, one "to identify and express the 'essence' of the community."<sup>170</sup> Rare are the opportunities when historians are in a position to directly ask the object of their research for an answer to the question that troubles them. But Pribojević is one of the exceptions to this rule. In the introductory part of his *Oratio*, Pribojević clearly states what he considers to be his identity: "But, because I have, as a Dalmatian, and therefore as an Illyrian and finally as a Slav, decided to hold a speech about the

---

166... i nalegoše na jazyk hrvatski. For more see Marin Franičević, pp. 36-37.

167For more on the Croatian edition of LJPD, see footnote no. 110 in the previous chapter.

168...i da bi već Hrvati nigdar ne imali gospodina od svoga jezika. Šišić, *Letopis*, 416.

169I tako Žudiji inim služe, ne imajući ni oni od svog jazyka gospodina. Ibid., 416.

170Ethnicity, p. 6.

destiny of Slavs in front of the Slavs..."<sup>171</sup>

In examining this sentence the first issue one encounters is not a lack of identity, but rather a surplus of it: Dalmatian, Illyrian and Slav. The problem of multiple identities is a well-known Renaissance phenomenon. Many such examples of multiple identities are found among Italian humanists, Machiavelli's boasting of Florentine patriotism does not in any way prevent him from shedding a tear for the sorrowful state of Italy, due to the new invasion of the northern barbarians.

To successfully cope with Pribojević's three level identity, namely Dalmatian, Illyrian and Slav, one must understand the meaning behind each of these names, and their mutual relationships, whether they were exclusive or inclusive. Furthermore, two more issues must be taken into consideration. The first is Pribojević's use of language as a basic criterion for determining one's identity, and the second is the recurrent references Croatian<sup>172</sup> as their native language made by the majority of Dalmatian humanists.

### 2.1. ... and finally as a Slav

At the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Dalmatian towns were long ago Slavicized. Although the language of the learned and educated was still Latin and that of the administration was Italian, the language of the home, bed and street was Croatian.<sup>173</sup> This process was not limited to the lower strata of society, on the contrary, it had penetrated all levels of society, from peasants and fishermen, to merchants, clerks and the urban nobility of the Dalmatian communes. The commune of Island of Hvar, was no exception to this rule. Hence his proud declaration: and finally as a Slav, one in sharp contrast with the negative attitude towards the Slavs found in many medieval Dalmatian sources. One of such examples could be found in one of Pribojević's predecessors, also a priest and a historian. The person in question is Toma Archdeacon, author of the already mentioned *Historia salonitana*<sup>174</sup> and archdeacon of Split archbishoprics. The two are separated by three centuries of historical developments, namely the transformation of Dalmatian communes, from a Latin strongholds to the cradles of Slavic (Croatian) culture.

The Slav name is one with its own history, whose meaning and usage on the eastern shore of the Adriatic changed with the passage of time. The beginnings of this story take us back into the past, to a time of the early Middle Ages and the coming of the Slavs to the Balkan peninsula.

---

<sup>171</sup>Verum quia Dalmata et proinde Illyrius ac demum Slauus coram Slauis de Slauorum fortunis sermonem habere statui, ... Pribojević, 1997, p. 56

<sup>172</sup>Marko Marulić, the most famous of Dalmatian humanists from the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century in his epic *Judita* (1500, published in Venice 1521), in the title of the work he says, that he has composed it in "*versih hrvatskih*" (Croat lyrics) but at the end of the work Marulić states that his work will last "*dokle zemlja ova bude na karte folij slovinjska slova čitat*" (until this land would read Slavic letters). For this and other examples of parallel usage of Croatian and Slavic ethnonyms see Rafo Bogišić, "Hrvatski Barokni Slavizam" (Croatian Baroque Slavism) in *Zrcalo Duhovno* (Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1997) pp. 140-146.

<sup>173</sup>See the footnote above.

<sup>174</sup>The overall tone of Toma Chronicle is one of communal isolation, defensive against all outside influences. Toma's universe is built around his hometown, 13<sup>th</sup> century Split, at that time still not fully Slavic. For Toma the Slavs are servants in house of inhabitants of Split. See Toma Arhidakon, p. 40; Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, pp. 370-371, 519.

The name Slav by its origin was an 'external' name, one used by not-Slavs to refer to them. For Latin citizens of Dalmatian towns, the newcomers in their neighborhood were called the Slavs (*Sclauī*), their language *lingua sclavonica*, and their newly founded polities – discernible one from another, were referred to as *Sclavonia* (lands of the Slavs).

As time passed, the situation changed. The titles of the Croatian rulers provide insight into the stages of that process. Early sources speaking of Slav invasion of Balkan peninsula mention only the generic Slav name. In the ninth century, when we have the first sources of "Croatian" provenience, the name Croat began to appear. The first such case was a charter issued by dux Trpimir in 852, where he is styled as dux Croatorum,<sup>175</sup> but at the same time, the title of Trpimir in the records of the Saxon Benedictine monk Gottschalk, is *rex Sclavorum*.<sup>176</sup>

Throughout the century, both names continue to be used. The Papal Chancery used the title of *dux Sclavorum* for Domagoj and *comitti Sclavorum* for his successor Zdeslav. The Venetian chronicler of the 10<sup>th</sup> century John the Deacon, also refers to the Croats as the Slavs, for example dux Domagoj is *pessimus Sclavorum dux*, but also sometimes he referred to them as the Croat-Slavs, *Croatorum Sclavorum*. The case of the dux Branimir is similar, of the two stone signs with his name, on one he is called *dux Slavorum*, and on the other as *dux Cruatorum*.<sup>177</sup> Finally, in the tenth century, the Croatian ethnonym in the title of the ruler and in the name of the polity became a dominant one, both in the sources of Croatian origin as well as in those made by others.<sup>178</sup> So it came, that beside the Slav name that was used more with its ethnic meaning, to refer both to the Slavs as a wide community of people, but also to the Croats as members of that large family, a new name Croatian emerged. One that was used to refer to the members of the specific polity, independent medieval Croatian state.<sup>179</sup>

In the following centuries, (9<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> century), through the development of Slavic literary tradition, based on the usage of 'Slavic' letters (Cyrillic, Glagolitic or western cyrillic – so-called *bosančica*), and writing in the Slavic language (known as Church Slavonic), the Slavic name became fully accepted as an internal name. The name Slav was adopted by the Slavs, and used equally with other Slav ethnic names to refer to themselves. Hence, the Croatian philologist Radoslav Katičić argues that it is plausible to substitute the term Slav, within the frame of one literary tradition with the name Croat, or Serb or Bulgar in another one.<sup>180</sup>

But for the Slavic name to acquire the meaning it held at the time of Pribojević, as a name used by Croats/Dalmatians to refer to themselves as members of a large linguistic community of peoples, one more obstacle had to be overcome. The

<sup>175</sup>Ferdo Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u doba narodnih vladara* (History of Croats in the Age of Popular Rulers) (Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1990) pp. 330-331. (henceforth Ferdo Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata*)

<sup>176</sup>Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u srednjem vijeku* (History of the Croats in the Middle Ages) (Zagreb: Globus, 1990) pp. 57-58.

<sup>177</sup>Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, pp. 139-140.

<sup>178</sup>King Tomislav who ruled from around 910-928, is in the records of the ecclesiastical synods of Split in 925 and 928, called by the title of *rex Chroatorum*. Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, pp. 139-140.

<sup>179</sup>Rafo Bogišić, *Hrvatski barokni slavizam*, p. 141.

<sup>180</sup>Radoslav Katičić, *Ilirci i ilirski jezik*, p. 677-678.

Hungarian linguistic membrane needed to be penetrated and the links with their northern brethren, the Czechs, Slovaks and Poles, reestablished. Two factors in the 15<sup>th</sup> century accelerated this process. First, the rise of humanism which made the universities of Prague and Krakow frequent destinations of Croat humanists. But even more important was the emergence of the Buda Royal court as a major regional humanist center, one that attracted many Croatian humanists in search of employment. The second factor is to be found in the political developments of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, namely the struggle of the Jagellonians for the Hungarian throne and King Matthias war for Bohemian, which brought many Croats into contact with their northern kin, either through diplomatic or other state services (including the war campaigns).

Apart from this development concerning the internal usage of the Slav name among the Croats, in the West, throughout the Middle Ages, the name Slav (*Schiavoni* in Italy; the country with highest number of Slav immigrants) remained the most used reference for the Croatians and Dalmatians living and working outside their homeland.<sup>181</sup> The situation remained unchanged until the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when the new ethnonym *Illyricus* challenged the traditional one.

## 2.2. ... as a Dalmatian, and therefore as an Illyrian

In the first half of 15<sup>th</sup> century, the word Illyria reentered vocabulary on the eastern shore of the Adriatic Sea<sup>182</sup>. The name Illyrian like no other in Croatian history has been subject to changes in its meaning, and usages. During the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century, the usage of the Illyrian name was still not standardized, the word had not yet been measured, and for different persons it held different meanings.

The first among Dalmatians to define the territorial span of Illyria was Juraj Šižgorić in his *De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenico* (1487). After a short presentation of several opinions by ancient authors, he gives his understanding of the borders of Illyria: to the north it is closed by the Kingdom of Hungary, to the west the region of Friuli, to the east, the Black Sea and to the south it borders with Macedonia.<sup>183</sup> Furthermore for Šižgorić Dalmatia is the most noble part of the Illyric,<sup>184</sup> but he strongly disapproves the usage of the Slav name. A similar usage of the names can be found in Koriolan Cipiko and his *De bello Asiatico* (1477), also separated from Pribojević by almost one half a century. In his work, Koriolan for the inhabitants of Balkan peninsula is using ethnonyms Dalmatian, Illyrian, Thracian and Macedonia.<sup>185</sup> His choice of names closely resembles the definition of Illyria offered by Šižgorić. For both, although Dalmatia was part of the Illyric, the Dalmatians were by the usage of their own name somehow separated from the other Illyrians, who, lacking their specific sub-names, were referred to just as Illyrians.<sup>186</sup>

181Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*, pp. 467-468.; Krno Prijatelj, "Likovni umjetnici 'Schiavoni' iz Dalmacije u 15. stoljeću (Visual Artists 'Schiavoni' from Dalmatia in 15<sup>th</sup> century)," in *Dani hvarskog kazališta: Hrvatski humanizam – Dubrovnik i Dalmatinske komune*. vol. XVII. (Split: Književni krug, 1991) pp. 260-269.

182See previous chapter, section concerning the Illyrian heritage.

183Šižgorić, *De Situ*, pp. 19-20, 52-57.

184*Provinciarum Illyriae Dalmatia habetur nobillissima*. Šižgorić, *De Situ*, p. 25.

185Koriolan Cipiko, *passim*.

186For overview of usage of Illyrian name among Dalmatian humanists see also Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, *Tradicija*, pp. 155-164.

The Illyrian name was, at the time, free of all political connotations. In the 15<sup>th</sup> and first half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, there was no Kingdom of Illyria, or even plans for one, as it was to be the case at the turn of the century, when the Dukes of Savoy and Mantua, in their search for the available royal title were drawn in that direction.<sup>187</sup> Furthermore, this term, as Radoslav Katičić states, existed solely within the Latin literary tradition, from which the word *Illyricus* originated. In the vernacular literature, *Illyrian* is by Croatian and Dalmatian authors substituted with the term Croatian (*Hrvatski*) or *Slovinjski*.<sup>188</sup> Hence comes the claim that the name Illyrian was sometimes used to overcome political divisions and an unfavorable political situation; the rule of Venice in Dalmatia and its permanent strained relationship with the Jagiellons and later the Habsburgs.<sup>189</sup>

In contrast, the identifiers Dalmatian and Croatian contain real political dimensions. Due to the political developments that led to their separation from the Croatian kingdom, the population of Dalmatia began to use the Dalmatian name for themselves, while the name Croat (in works written in Latin the Croats were identified with Antique *Kureti*) was used to refer to the inhabitants of the lands to the north, a part of the kingdom of Hungary-Croatia. Nevertheless, their native language they still called Croatian or Slavic (*Slovinjski*), when referring to it in the vernacular, or Dalmatian, Illyrian or Slavic in Latin or Italian.

In his *Oratio*, Pribojević mentions Croatia only twice, first as one of the contemporary Slavic lands<sup>190</sup>, and second as the northern border of Dalmatia.<sup>191</sup> The Illyrians and Illyria appear on many occasions, which brings us to the question of to what, and to whom does the name Illyrian in Pribojević's statement refers.

### 2.3. Who are the Illyrians of Pribojević's time?

The problem is that unlike Šižgorić,<sup>192</sup> Pribojević never gave a definition of Illyria, or clearly distinguished between Illyrians and the other south Slavs. But it is still possible to draw from his text Pribojević's understanding of to what does Illyria refer. First, from his self definition, mentioned above, we know that he counted the Dalmatians among the Illyrians. There are other clues in the text that help one to narrow the choice even more.

The first clue can be found in the previously mentioned Pribojević's understanding that religion is not one of the factors that determine whether someone is a Slav. As stated earlier, Pribojević argues that the ranks of the Ottoman sultans were filled by the Macedonians, Thracians and *Illyrians*.<sup>193</sup> This excludes the Macedonians<sup>194</sup>

187For more concerning this subject see Zdenko Zlatar, *Our Kingdom Come*, pp. 225-333

188Radoslav Katičić argues that the name Illyrian is just an extension of already mentioned medieval association from the discourse of Slavic literature, Slavic=Croatian, now extended to Latin and Italian literary discourse with association *Illyrice=Sclavonice*, meaning Illyrian equals Croatian. Radoslav Katičić, *Ilirci i Ilirski jezik*, p. 678.

189Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, "O povijesti uporabe ilirskog nazivlja (On the history of the usage of Illyrian name)." in *Spomenica Ljube Bobana* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1996) p. 133.

190Pribojević, 1997, pp. 59-60.

191Pribojević, 1997, pp. 76.

192See the previous section.

193Pribojević, 1997, p.

194This refers to the Bulgarians, in the already quoted list of Slavic lands (see above) Pribojević says: *et Bulgaria, quae olim Macedonia dicebatur*. Pribojević, 1997, pp. 59-60.

(meaning Bulgarians) and Thracians from among the list of possible Illyrians, narrowing the choice to the inhabitants of Slovenian lands, Ottoman conquered Serbia and Bosnia, and the Croatian kingdom. In this manner, Pribojević's notion of Illyria is compatible with the definition of the same found in Šižgorić's *De Situ*.

Perhaps it is possible to offer another interpretation, and to narrow the choice of possible Illyrians even further. As mentioned in the previous chapter one of the sources Pribojević used in his work was Marko Marulić's Latin translation of the Croatian edition of *Chronicle of the Diocletian Priest*. Pribojević refers to this work as *De Regibus Illyriorum*.<sup>195</sup> The problem is that Marco Marulić did not give any title to his work. The oldest transcript of his translation, from 1546, contains only his opening words, in which he greets Dominik Papalić, founder of the original Croatian edition:

Marcus Marulus domino Papali s(alutem)

Comentariolum a te in Craina nuper repertum, inter vetustissimas gentis illius scripturas dalmatico idiomate compositum, tuo rogatu latinum feci, Croatiae Dalmatique regum gesta continentem, res certe digna relatu, et quam non solum nostrae vernaculae linguae gnari, sed etiam Latini intelligant.<sup>196</sup>

Accordingly, the title given by Marulić to his translation would be *Croatiae, Dalmatique regum gesta*, which Pribojević freely translated to *De Regibus Illyriorum*. This substitution of Croatia and Dalmatia for Illyria enables us to further narrow possible Pribojević's understanding of Illyria to its final form, as that of Croatia and Dalmatia.<sup>197</sup> Another possible interpretation is that of Dalmatia and Croatia as the core provinces of Illyria, the minimal requirement that make usage of Illyrian name plausible.

### **3. Appendix to the Myth of Origin**

#### **3.1. The Role of the Myth of Origin in Theories of Ethnicity**

The purpose of the myths of origin in the complex set of meanings that underlies the sense of ethnic ties is to provide the community with the answer to the question of who are we on the basis of who were we, or better where do we come from. This is the first step in positioning of the community in reference to the others, and providing it with a solid basis for development of its sense of difference and uniqueness.<sup>198</sup>

---

<sup>195</sup>Pribojević, 1997, p. 66, 72.

<sup>196</sup>Ferdo Šižić, *Letopis*, p. 382.

<sup>197</sup>Since Croatian edition is a "history" of medieval Croatia which included some parts of what is later to become a Bosnian medieval kingdom, this parts should also be considered as encompassed by the above name of Dalmatia and Croatia. Hence Pribojević understanding of Illyria is quite similar to another, little later interpretation dealing with the question of which are the lands encompassed by the Illyrian name. The interpretation in question, is the 17<sup>th</sup> century debate concerning the right of usage of facilities of Fraternity of St. Jerome in Rome, intended for usage by *nationis Illyricae*. The Holy Rota finally in 1655 reached decision stating that under Illyrian province one should consider Dalmatia, Croatia, Slavonia and Bosnia. See Radoslav Katičić, *Ilirci i ilirski jezik*, pp. 680-681.

<sup>198</sup>For more on the role of the myth of origins see Anthony Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, pp. 24-25; and for detailed categorization and analysis of role of myths see Anthony Smith, *Myths*

As mentioned in the previous chapter, Pribojević was the first among the south Slavs to construct and publish a genealogy of the Slavs. His construction falls into the category of myth making tradition based on the claim of chroniclers and poets on the genealogical link of their community with a noble hero, founder or a deity, in this case, it was a lineage of all Slavs from Thyras, son of Japhet, seventh son of Noah. Apart from being an excellent humanistic construction, it does not fully qualify as a myth of origin for Pribojević's community, Dalmatia. It is a myth of origin for the Slavs in general, and as such it does not serve its main purpose, and that is to clearly distinguish Pribojević's community (Dalmatia) from the others, by providing it with its own distinctive origin.

### 3.2. The Legend of the Three Brothers: Czech, Lech and Rus

Cultural similarities and numerous political, economic and historical connections of western Slavs, namely the Poles and Czech's through the centuries inspired many to try to explain them through myth of common origin of both kingdoms. According to the legend, the founding fathers of the both kingdoms originated from the south, namely from Dalmatia-Croatia or in earlier cases Panonia, depending on the the version of the legend. The origins of this legend can be traced to the already mentioned Nestor Chronicle of the 13<sup>th</sup> century,<sup>199</sup> and from there it can be followed through various Czech and Polish medieval chronicles.<sup>200</sup>

The honor of being the first among the South Slavs to publish this legend, and incorporate it into local mytho-religious complex, belongs to Pribojević, who most probably become familiar with it during his stay in Krakow.<sup>201</sup> In his *Oratio*, Pribojević tells a story of the three brothers (Czech, Lech and Rhus), who due to the internal wars were banished from their homeland Dalmatia. These three brothers soon became rulers over the Slavic lands in the north and founded their kingdoms. The inhabitants of those lands received their names according to them, namely Czechs from Czech, Poles from Lech and Russians from Rus.<sup>202</sup>

Be this as it may, we come to the question of importance and the role of this legend. It is possible to see it as an appendix, as an additional layer to the myth of common Slav origin, which secures the distinctive role of the uniqueness of Dalmatia as the cradle of Slavhood. Furthermore this interpretation also helps to explain the

---

*and Memories of the Nation*, pp. 57-70.

199Nestor identifies the lands around Danube as the first homeland of the Slavs. See Nestor, *Latopis*, pp. 552-553.

200Very interesting is the development of this story in the Polish historiography, where the number of the brothers is with the passage of the time changed. Early records of this legend, like the one in the chronicle of Bishop Boguchwał, contains version with three brothers, Czech, Lech and Rus (Mech) but in the later versions only two brothers: Czech and Lech are present. Such is the case in Jan Długosz's *Annales* and Maciej Miechowita, *Chronica Polonorum* where only Czech and Lech (Lach in Długosz) are found.; Długosz, *Annales*, pp. 70-71.; Maciej Miechowita, *Chronica Polonorum* (Krakow: Krajowa Agencja Wydawnicza, 1986) pp.1-2. ; Boguchwał, pp. 468-469.

201Authors Pribojević quotes as his sources for this story are: Aenea Sylivius Piccolomini and his *Historia Bohemica*, where indeed this story is told, and *Tractatus de duobus Sarmatiis* by Maciej Miechowita and *Annales Polonorum*, in both of the works only version of the legend with the two brothers is present. Furthermore version of the legend brought by Pribojević had more similarities with the one found in mentioned Chronicle of Boguchwał (see the previous footnote) then the one in Miechowita or Długosz. For more see Joanna Rapacka, pp. 168-175.

202Pribojević, 1997. p. 64.



longevity of this legend in Croatian historiography, when the origins of the brothers was shifted from Dalmatia back to the Croatia, keeping it alive until the 19<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>203</sup>

#### 4. Locating Patria

Indeed, by no means we are born only for ourselves, but rather for fatherland, friends and the community good.<sup>204</sup>

An association with specific territory is of utmost importance to ethnicity because of an alleged and felt symbiosis between a certain place on earth and its community.<sup>205</sup> The question as to which is this land for Pribojević is easy to answer. The fact that two-thirds of his work is dedicated to Dalmatia (second part to Dalmatia in general, and the third to the island of Hvar in particular), further supported by the central position of Dalmatia even in the first part which deals with the history of the Slavs, leaves no space for further speculation. Furthermore, Pribojević also provides a definition of what are the main qualities of a good country:

There are three factors, noble readers, all I think are well known to you, which are of utmost importance for praise of any country, namely its position and fertility, inborn good attributes of its inhabitants and their laws and customs.<sup>206</sup>

This is also the outline Pribojević uses for his description of Dalmatia, which needless to say, possesses all the mentioned features, and even more.

Nevertheless, this leads to another question. Just by declaring Dalmatia, as that particular piece of the world in question, we have not clearly defined the territory it relates to. Since Antiquity, the borders of Dalmatia have undergone significant changes. Therefore the name of Dalmatia holds many meanings, ranging from a thin strip of the land along the coast, to the entire territory between the Drava River and

---

203From Pribojević this legend was adopted by several Dalmatian writers of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century, but it also can be found in the works of northern Croatian authors, such as Juraj Rattkay and Pavo Ritter Vitezović, who take the version of this legend from Czech and Polish sources. In their works the the legend differs from the one found in Pribojević, in number and the origin of brothers. Juraj Rattkay tells the version with only two brothers Czech and Lech, Croats from Krapina (town in northern Croatia), while Vitezović's brothers are also Croats from Krapina, but there is again three of them. See Pavao Ritter Vitezović, *Oživjela Hrvatska* (Revived Croatia), tr. Zlatko Pleše, (Zagreb: Golden Marketing and Narodne novine, 1997) p. 97, 169; Juraj Rattkay, *Spomen na kraljeve i banove kraljevstava Hrvatske, Slavonije i Dalmacije* (Memory on the Kings and Bans of Kingdom of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia), tr. Zrinka Blažević et al. (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001) p. 138.; For detailed overview of the development of this legend in Croatian historiography see Ferdo Šišić, "Ideja slavenske pradomovine u Podunavlju. Biologija priče o Čehu, Lehu i Mehu" (The Idea of Slavic Homeland in Transdanubia. Biology of the Story of Čeh, Lech and Mech), *Godišnjica Nikole Čupića*, no. 35 (1935): pp. 33-49.

204Non enim nobis solis nati sumus, sed potius patriae, amicis et communi utilitati. Pribojević, 1997, p. 48.

205Anthony Smith, *Ethnic Origins of the Nations*, p. 28.

206Tribvs ex causis unamquaque regionem maxime comendari uobis, uiri praestantissimi, satis compertum esse existimo, uidelicet ex situ cum fertilitate ac ex naturalibus incolarum bonis conditionibus nec non ex ipso populorum in ea degentium studio, legibus et consuetudinibus. Pribojević, 1997. p.75.

Adriatic Sea.<sup>207</sup>

This time fortunately, Pribojević provides the readers with the borders of *his* Dalmatia, defining it as he says "as has lately become the habit, not to use ancient borders for these provinces."<sup>208</sup> Pribojević's Dalmatia stretches from Istria to the west to the Epir and Macedonia to the East, to the north its boundaries reaches Croatia and Bosnia and to the south, "the sea called Adriatic washes its shores."<sup>209</sup>

As he states, Pribojević abandoned the ancient borders of the provinces, but his Dalmatia is not limited only to the current possessions of the Republic of St. Mark.<sup>210</sup> It also includes the last possessions of the Hungarian-Croatian kingdom on the Adriatic, and the territory of the Republic of Dubrovnik.<sup>211</sup> Its western and eastern borders are traditional borders of the Roman province of Dalmatia, when the entire coast between Istria and *Epirus* was a single administrative unit, but its northern borders are the recognition of 16<sup>th</sup> century realities, the Hungarian-Croatian kingdom, and Ottoman empire.

What does this tell us? Obviously the size of *patria*, does not play a significant role in Pribojević's eyes, otherwise he would have put forth a claim on the borders of Roman province of Dalmatia, and significantly move its border further to the north. However maybe we can assume that there was another criteria, which influenced Pribojević to draw the borders in a way he did. Indeed, the borders of Dalmatia are defined in such a way that includes all cultural centers of Croatian Renaissance, both the Dalmatian communes, Kvarner seaside and the Republic of Ragusa. Juraj Šižgorić in his *De Situ* was not as pragmatic as Hvar Dominican. His borders of Dalmatia were more traditional, to the west the border was not set to Istria, but rather to *Liburnia*. Hence, Šižgorić's Dalmatia does not include Zadar, Pag and Nin. What separates these two Dalmatian humanists is 50 years of "rapid" cultural development. While Šižgorić among learned Dalmatians could count only St. Jerome, Pribojević's list is the image of a thriving cultural community, consequence of the last 50 years of development. Therefore, the span of Pribojević's Dalmatia encompasses the entire space of Dalmatian Republic of Letters, covering representatives of all urban centers from Zadar (Fridrih Gorsigono and Šimun Kožić Benja), to Kotor (brothers Vincent and Dominik Buća).

---

207The classical northern border of the Roman province of Dalmatia lay a little south of the river Sava. Pribojević's contemporary, historian from Ragusa, Ludovik Crijević Tuberon in his work *Comentaria suorum temporum* puts the northern border of Dalmatia to the Drava River, thus taking as a natural border for the province a linguistic border between the Hungarian and the Croatian language, unlike Pribojević who as a subject of Venice was careful not to provoke a response from his government, and therefore chose the current north political borders. Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, *Komentari o mojem vremenu* (Comments on my Epoch), ed. Mirko Valentić, tr. Vlado Rezar (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001) p. 10. ; (henceforth Tuberon, *Komentari*). Since the Latin edition was not available I am using the Croatian translation. All quotes from Croatian to English translated by the author.

208Pribojević, 1997, p. 75.

209Pribojević, 1997, p. 75.

210For a detailed description of political developments, see chapter 2.

211In his short description of Dalmatian towns, for *Segnia* Pribojević, does not even mention that it is currently part of another polity, and for Durbrovnik it records: " famous town, because of its richness, ships and liberty, which Ragusans guards with skilled eagerness and awareness, and making all of their major decisions through the senate..." Pribojević. 1997, p. 85.

## 5. Sense of Solidarity and the Emergence of Pan-Slavism

The last question, sense of solidarity, brings us back to Pribojević's so-called Pan-Slavism. It is hard to imagine any community without at least some level of solidarity. For the Hvar Dominican, a sense of solidarity is in the spatial sphere defined in a broad manner. Pribojević's sense of belonging and solidarity is extended to the entire Slavic world, from the Baltic to Adriatic sea, from the Czech Alps all the way to the Ural mountains. On the other hand, however its intensity is limited outside the borders of Dalmatia. The sentiment Pribojević demonstrates towards other neighboring Slavic (Illyrian) lands such as Croatia, Bosnia or Slovenian lands is the same as the one he demonstrates for the Poles or Czechs. In the *Oratio*, there is no reference to a special relationship among the vaguely defined "Illyrian *natio*." There is no trace of specific common traits or bonds that they allegedly should feel. How can this be explained?

To answer this question, one other issue must be addressed first: the role of the Slavic world in Pribojević's *Oratio* and its relation to Dalmatia. In spite of all the glory and esteem that Pribojević attributes Dalmatia, the fact that it was a European periphery and basically a Venetian maritime colony, could not be ignored. To overcome this, and to be able to stand the comparison to the other countries, Dalmatia had to be a part of a larger entity. In the case of Pribojević, this framework is found in the Slavic world, world which stretched from the Adriatic to Baltic, and from the Odra River to the mountains of Ural. And the place of Dalmatia in that huge Slavic world is quite unique. Apart from being the alleged cradle of the Slavhood, its heritage from Antiquity is one unmatched in the Slavic world: among its sons, several popes, Saints and Roman Emperors can be counted. Its cultural achievements are extraordinary, as well as its long tradition of urban life, with towns truly founded by Roman emperors. All of this, in the age of humanism, makes Dalmatia the most noble part of that world. In light of these notions, what could a closer association with the other contemporary Illyrians contribute to the Dalmatia in the terms of "fama" or "gloria"?

Since Pribojević never mentions any achievements of the medieval Serbian state (or almost any other Orthodox state), one that during the reign of Emperor Dušan less than 200 years ago was fighting for the heritage of the Eastern Roman Empire, he is obviously not interested in acquiring this heritage.<sup>212</sup> On the other hand, the military valor of the Croats, no matter how much praised by some Dalmatian humanists, did not by itself have enough weight to initiate the connection with this other part of Pribojević's mythic Illyria. Not to mention the probably unfavorable reaction of the Venetian government in case of a call for any kind of unity among Dalmatia and Croatia. Obviously the esteem of the Dalmatia was such that it did not require a

---

<sup>212</sup>The reason for this is most probably Pribojević's Catholic background. Early 16<sup>th</sup> century was still the age when there were things the sense of solidarity could not overcome. Unlike his successor Mauro Orbini, who in his *History of the Slavs*, places high emphasis on achievements of various Orthodox Balkan states, Pribojević simply ignores their (at moments truly glorious) histories. The only Orthodox state he mentioned is the Moscovite state, whose role in *Oratio* is reduced to several pieces of information given *en passant*: they were defeated by valorous Poles; the rank of their ruler is the Grand Duke (one lower than the rank of the Polish king); they speak Dalmatian language; and in their land is located the city of Novgorod, which is larger than the Rome itself. Pribojević, 1997, pp. 65, 72-73.

closer link with the other parts of Illyria. Moreover, contemporary Illyrians do not offer anything in the sphere of fame that Pribojević would be interested.

The other possible argument in support of call for unity among Illyrian *natio* can be located in the Ottoman threat. Theories of ethnicity postulate the outside threat as one of the most cohesive forces in the development of a collective identity,<sup>213</sup> and the outside threat is definitely not lacking from Pribojević's historical perspective. In comparison to the majority of works by Dalmatian humanists of the early 16<sup>th</sup> century, the Turkish motive is in the *Oratio* quite underrepresented. Nevertheless, if we exclude single reference to the Polish-Tatar conflict, the Ottomans are the only contemporary enemies of the Slavs.

Although Pribojević attempted to turn even this unhappy situation in favor of the Slavs, acquiring for them even the glory of Ottoman arms. As Pribojević stated in the already mentioned passage, the Ottoman sultan maintained 20,000 strong Janissary corps, filled exclusively by Slavs (Macedonians, Thracians and Illyrians), and "by the use of the Slavic troops" he "overcomes kingdoms, obtains empires, takes over strongly fortified cities and with all the force presses to ruin the Roman Empire, and if the hand of the God almighty does not assist us, they will destroy the true faith."<sup>214</sup>

The empires mentioned by Pribojević, apart from the Eastern Roman Empire, also include the medieval Bulgarian and Serbian (Slav) empires. Although he does not mention it, the chronology of defeats does not stop here. In 1459, the Serbian Despotate crumbled in front of the Ottoman advance, in 1463 Bosnia fell without a major battle, and by 1482 Hercegovina was lost. With the conquest of Bosnia, Dalmatia and Croatia were open to Turkish raids, and by 1525 when Pribojević gave his *Oratio* on the still peaceful and quiet Island of Hvar, the defensive system built by King Matthias, namely the Banats of Jajce and Srebrenica, were overrun by the Turks, four years earlier the "gates to the kingdom" the fortress of Belgrade fell. In such a situation what good would another call for unity of the "Illyrians" do?

Therefore, the question why his *Oratio* did not call for the unity of the Illyrian *nation* against this threat is one with a two part answer. First, it was already too late, a significant part of the Illyrian *natio* had already fallen. And second, what remained free was already, although not politically, but certainly emotionally united in its resistance to the invaders. For the last 50 years, Dalmatian and Croatian prelates, humanists and nobles traveled around European courts seeking aid, advocating anti-Turkish crusades and of late even threatening with possible submission to the Turks if no help came soon.<sup>215</sup> As the examples of Ivan Statalić from Trogir, Šimun Kožić Benja from Zadar and Petar Berislavić from Trogir, bishop of Skradin and later ban

---

<sup>213</sup>Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, pp. 54-57.

<sup>214</sup>Pribojević, 1997, p. 73

<sup>215</sup>This threat repeatedly appears in 16<sup>th</sup> century anti-Turkish orations given by Dalmatian and Croatian humanists. The oldest one can be found in oration called "*De Corvatiæ desolatione*" given by Šimun Kožić Benja (Simonis Begni) in 1513 on 6<sup>th</sup> Church Lateran council. Vedran Gligo, *Govori protiv turaka* (Orations against the Turks) (Split: Splitski književni krug, 1983) p. 334.; furthermore from the oratio given by Stjepan Posredarski (Stephani Possidarski) also in front of Leon X it is clear that his lord Ivan Karlović -ban of Croatia (Ioannes Torquatus Manlius) has already began paying a tribute to the Ottomans to save Croatian lands under his protection from further destruction, Vedran Gligo, pp. 337-342.; Other examples can be found in the orations given by various members of Frankapan family, Bernardin (1522), Krsto (1523), Vuk (1530) and Fran (1541). See Vedran Gligo, pp. 343-376.

of Croatia (1513-1521), testify, in spite of the political division, the link between Croatia and Dalmatia was never completely broken. Many Dalmatian humanists found a new home in the northern kingdom, putting all of their energies into the service of the cause to prevent the further ruin of Croatia and Dalmatia.

The Ottoman empire was still not showing any sign of weakness that would encourage a call for unity of the Illyrian Slavs and an insurrection to overthrow the Ottoman yoke, as the situation would look 70 years later when Mauro Orbini wrote his *History of the Slavs*.<sup>216</sup>

The reality of Pribojević contemporaries was unfortunately quite different. One year after his speech, on 29<sup>th</sup> of August 1526 at Mohacs, the Hungarian kingdom experienced the bitter taste of defeat, in 1529 Vienna was to see its first siege, and Suleiman was to acquire the nickname the Magnificent. In such a gloomy situation, Pribojević gazes further, beyond the borders of his humiliated Slavic brothers, and sees the still intact prosperous northern kingdoms of the Slavs. His intention is to remind his countrymen that they are not alone, and to give them some hope and pride in the expectation that this sad state of affairs will someday end, and the glory of the past return.

---

<sup>216</sup>Together with the overall change of the political situation, the understanding of who are Illyrians by the 1600 also changed. Orbini's understanding of Illyrian membership is wider than Pribojević's (see above). This is closely connected with a) counter reformation efforts undertaken by Jesuit missionaries in order to win over the Balkan Slavs, and as a direct consequence of this activity; and b) Papacy renewed interest in crusade against Turks, and various anti-Turkish plots that followed it. For this see Zlatar, *Our Kingdom come*, pp.225-298. ; Zlatar, *Between the Double Eagle and the Crescent*, pp. 58-65. For an overview of the development of usages of Illyrian name see recent study by Sándor Bene, "Ideološke koncepcije o staleškoj državi Zagrebačkog kanonika" (Ideological conceptions of the State of Estates by Zagreb Canonic), in Juraj Ratkay, *Spomen na kraljeve i banove Kraljevstva Hrvatske, Slavonije i Dalmacije* (Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001) pp. 71-80. (henceforth Sándor Bene, *Ideološke koncepcije*); Radoslav Katičić, *Ilirci i ilirski jezik*, pp. 677-688.; Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, *O povijesti uporabe*, pp. 133 – 143.

## 5. Conclusion

### **1. Instead of Conclusion: the Role of the Past and How to Connect it to the Present**

One could claim that one of the most striking differences between the modern nationalisms and the "nationalism" of Pribojević's time is their attitude towards the past and its role in the present. In the majority of the cases of modern nationalism, it is the relationship between the past and the territory that is dominant, and the role of the history as a "lawyer" who supports the historical rights of the nation to a particular territory. On the other hand, the function of the past in the works of Pribojević and his contemporaries was to provide the esteem for the community; of course this did not exclude the political implications such esteem could bring, but it was not instrumentally centered on territory. What was of importance was *grandezza* (as Machiavelli would put it); hence territorial expansion was not the aim, but rather only one of the means of achieving greatness.

This is especially true in the case of Pribojević. His indifferent attitude towards the question of borders and territory, reveals how little significance it holds for him. He did not waste any time to define the borders of Illyria. Dalmatia of Pribojević's oratio does not consist only of eastern Adriatic possessions of the Republic of St. Mark. Its borders were set wider, in order to encompass everything he held to be of importance (all urban centers from *Istria* to *Epirus*).<sup>217</sup> Unlike *Tuberon*, his Ragusan counterpart, who, with the higher degree of historical sensibility, placed the northern border of Dalmatia at the Drava River, for Pribojević regions behind the Velebit Mountains held no interest. In matters of esteem contemporary Illyric has little to offer. On the other hand, what does interest him is the glorious past, in which ancient Illyrians do play a significant role: Illyrians, who are only one among the many "Slavic" *gentes* – such as Macedonians, Goths and Vandals – whose history is filled with military achievements and successes, revealing that military virtue of the Slavs, which put them on the same footing as the Romans and Germans.

What follows is an analysis of the Pribojević's solution to the problem of how to connect the past and present, within the context of Dalmatian historiography of his time.

As mentioned in the previous chapters, a claim on the heritage of the past, that of the Illyrians in the case of Pribojević, is established by securing the *ethnic continuity* between them and the inhabitants of his time. For Pribojević, the same people, descendants of Thyrsas, inhabited the lands of the Balkan peninsula from time immemorial to the present day. As mentioned, this he attempted to prove by the usage of arguments of common descent, language and customs. Judging by his strict insistence on the humanity understood as the posterity of Adam, being divided by lines of descent into various *gentes* and *nationes*, one could almost categorize Pribojević's understanding of collective identity as one of the first works of the primordialist theory.

As Bruna Kuntić-Makvić pointed out, Pribojević took over this concept of ethnic

<sup>217</sup>See chapter "Dalmatian Republic of Letters" in chapter one, and "Locating Patria" in chapter three.

continuity, one that disregards Slav migration to the peninsula in the 6<sup>th</sup> century, from the Šižgorić's work *De situ Illyriae*, who first among Dalmatian humanists formulated the claim of ancient heritage of Dalmatia in such a manner.<sup>218</sup> Bruna Kuntić-Makvić further argues that it was not the only alternative present among the Dalmatian humanists of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century. While both Šižgorić and Pribojević, although in a different manner (see above), claimed Dalmatian-Illyrian ancient tradition, the Ragusan historian Ludovik Cijević Tuberon,<sup>219</sup> claimed the Dalmatian-Latin(Roman) tradition for his home town of Ragusa and Dalmatia in general.

Unlike Pribojević, Tuberon in his *Comentaria*, discards the idea of autochtonity of the Slavs, and openly declares the coming of the Slavs (descendants of Russians and Goths) to the Balkan Peninsula around the year 600, when they conquered and imposed their language on the local population.<sup>220</sup> Hence, he concludes that the inhabitants of Dalmatia and Illyric today use the same language as the Czech's, Poles and Russians, except that the Dalmatians because of the tender climate, speak in a softer dialect.<sup>221</sup> Nevertheless, what is of importance for Tuberon is that the language of Dalmatia and the entire Illyrian Province before the coming of the Slavs was Latin, "which many of the Dalmatians use today." That is why:

the other peoples that inhabit the continental parts of Illyric, call the maritime Dalmatians Latins. And not because they pay the homage to the Roman Pope, but rather because they use the Latin language, they live as the Roman people and because they use the Latin letters.<sup>222</sup>

In this manner, Tuberon connects the ancient past and his time through cultural bounds. The Dalmatians are an ethnically mixed population but nevertheless are still heirs to the Roman tradition of ancient Dalmatia, because of their adoption of Roman culture and customs. It is easy to note that all of his criteria are purely cultural and social, there is no such strict (but rather abstract) dividing element as in

---

218In the following analysis I rely much on the work done by Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, in her already mentioned article on the historical tradition of the Dalmatia and Croatia in the works of Dalmatian humanists of 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century. The author has undertaken a comparative analysis of works by Šižgorić, Crijević and Pribojević with the results quite similar to those presented here, although with one slight difference. Bruna Kuntić-Makvić did not take into account all three components of Pribojević's argumentation, and based her analysis only on the language criterion. Thus lacking is what I hold of importance for full understanding of Pribojević's solution, namely his argument of common descent. Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, *Tradicija*, pp. 156-159.

219His work *Comentaria suorum temporum* is an overview of contemporary events in Hungarian-Croatian kingdom after the death of king Mathias. Nevertheless in humanistic manner his work is full of short digressions in which he tackles the problems and legends from more distant past. In one of such digression he discuss the origin of the South Slavs.

220Tuberon, *Komentari*, p. 11.

221The same notion that Russians speak Dalmatian language (*Dalmatarum sermone*), also appears in Pribojević's work. Pribojević, 1997. p. 65.; Furthermore the claim that Russians use Dalmatian language was not only present among Dalmatian writers, it seems that it was a more widely accepted notion. Famous Italian historiographer Paulo Giovio (Paulus Iovius 1483-1552) in his work *De legatione Basilij magni Principis Moscouiae ad Clementem VII. Pontificem Maximum* (Rome 1525) also associates the Russian language with those of the South Slavs, stating: "Moscovites use illyrian language and illyrian letters..." (*Moscovitae lingua Illyrica Illyricisque litteris utuntur...*); Taken from Ivan Golub, "Nova građa o Juraju Križaniću iz rimskih arhiva 1653-1657" (New sources concerning Juraj Križanić from the Roman Archives 1653-1657 ), *Starine JAZU*, vol. 57 (1978): p. 162.

222Ibid., p. 11.

Pribojević's usage of descent, that would predetermine someones identity. The Latin language and letters could be thought, customs and way of life adopted, and if necessary, faith changed. All of them are social constructs and therefore a subject to change. So if Pribojević could be put in a primordialist camp, then Tuberon's view could be characterized as one of the first socio-cultural constructivists.

Nevertheless, the historiographical tradition of Dalmatia and Croatia in the next centuries took a direction pointed by Šižgorić and Pribojević, and not that of Tuberon. In spite of the fact that later authors very rarely quote Pribojević as their source of information, many of his ideas through mediation of Mauro Orbini, who included large parts of Pribojević's work in his narrative,<sup>223</sup> found their way into the works of the next generations of writers.

The main feature of Pribojević's narrative that entered Croatian historiography, was the notion of Slav autochtonity on the Balkan peninsula, and their association with the ancient Illyrians. This idea in the following centuries went through a series of significant transformations, from Croatian Baroque Pan-Slavism of 17<sup>th</sup> century, over Pavao Ritter Vitezović's early 18<sup>th</sup> century Pan-Croatism and finally Ljudevit Gaj and 19<sup>th</sup> century Illyrism. Each of this transformations was a consequence of the adjustments to the challenges issued by the new epoch and its socio-political realities. One can, through the changes in the relations between the Slavic, Illyrian and Croatian name, follow the metamorphoses of the Pribojević's initial notion, that of the ethnic continuity of the inhabitants of "Illyria" from ancient times to the present.

---

<sup>223</sup>See mentioned study by Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff concerning the influence of Pribojević on Mauro Orbini, Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff, *Il Priboevo*, passim.



## Bibliography

### **Primary sources:**

- Cipiko, Koriolan. *O azijskom ratu* (About the Asian war), tr. Vedran Gligo. Split: Čakavski Sabor, 1977.
- Crijević, Ludovik Tuberon. *Komentari o mojem vrmenu* (Comments on my Epoch). ed. Mirko Valentić, tr. Vlado Rezar. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001.
- Fusko, Paladije. *Opis Obale Ilirika* (Description of the Illyrian Coast). tr. Bruna Kuntić-Makvić. Zagreb: Latina & Graeca, 1990.
- Gligo, Vedran. ed. *Govori protiv turaka* (Anti-Turkish Orations). Split: Logos, 1983.
- Golub, Ivan. "Nova građa o Juraju Križaniću iz rimskih arhiva 1653-1657 (New sources concerning Juraj Križanić from the Roman Archives 1653-1657 )." *Starine JAZU*, vol. 57. (1978): p. 162.
- Hayward C. T. R. tr. *Saint Jerom's Hebrew Question in Genesis*. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1995. p. 39.
- Ioannis Dlugosii, *Annales seu cronicae incliti regni Poloniae*. vol. 1 Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1964.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish antiquities*. tr. H. St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus et al. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981-1992.
- Kadlubkonis, Vincentii. "Magistri Vincentii Kadlubkonis Chronica Polonorum sive origine regum et principum Poloniae." in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica* vol. 2, pp. 249-453. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961.
- Krasić, Stjepan, "Regesti pisama generala dominikanskog reda poslatih u Hrvatsku" (Regestae of Letters Sent to Croatia by Generals of the Dominican Order) (1392-1600). *Arhivski vjesnik*, vols. 22-23 (1978-9): pp. 220-321.
- "Latopis Nestora." in *Monumenta Poloniae Historica* vol. 1, pp. 552-553. Warsaw: Panstwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1960.
- Miechowita, Maciej. *Chronica Polonorum*. Krakow: Krajowa Agencija Wydawnicza, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tractatus de duabus sarmatiis, Asiana et Europiana*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1936.
- Maciejowski, Wacław Alexander. ed. "Boguphali II episcopi posnaniensis Chronicon Poloniae cum continuatione Paskonis custodis posnaniensis." *Monumenta Poloniae Historica* vol. 2, pp. 454-598. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1961.

Orbini, Mavro. *Kraljevstvo Slavena* (Kingdom of the Slavs). Zagreb: Golden Marketing, Narodne novine, 1999.

Orbini, Mauro. *Il regno degli Slavi*, Munchen: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1985.

Pribijević, Vinko. *O podrijetlu i zgodama Slavena* (Concerning the origin and the glory of the Slavs). Zagreb: Golden marketing, Narodne novine, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Govor fra Vinka Pribojevića* (Fra Vinko Pribojević's Oration). Zagreb: Književni Krug, 1951.

Rattkay, Juraj. *Spomen na kraljeve i banove kraljevstava Hrvatske, Slavonije i Dalmacije* (Memory on the Kings and Bans of the Kingdom of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia). tr. Zrinka Blažević et al. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001.

Šišić, Ferdo. *Letopis popa Dukljanina* (Chronicle of the Priest of Dioclea). Belgrade: Srpska Kraljevska Akademija, 1928.

Šižgorić, Juraj. *O smještaju Ilirije i o gradu Šibeniku* (Concerning the Position of the Illyria and the town of Šibenik). Šibenik: Muzej grada, 1981.

Toma, Arhiđakon, *Kronika: splitski rukopis* (Chronicle: Split Manuscript), ed. Vladimir Rismondo. Split: Splitski književni krug, 1977.

Vitezović, Pavao Ritter. *Oživjela Hrvatska* (Revived Croatia). tr. Zlatko Pleše. Zagreb: Golden Marketing and Narodne novine, 1997.

*The Holy Bible, New International Version: containing the Old Testament and the New Testament*, Colorado Springs: International Bible Society, 1984.

## **Secondary Literature**

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.

Antoljak, Stjepan. *Hrvatska historiografija do 1918* (Croatian historiography up to 1918). vol I. Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1992.

Baron, Hans. *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni. Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature*. Chicago and London: The Chicago University Press, 1968.

Birnbaum, Marianna D. *Humanists in a Shattered World*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1986.

Bogišić, Rafo. "Hrvatski barokni slavizam" (Croatian Baroque Slavism). In *Zrcalo duhovno (književne studije)*, pp. 138–164. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna

naklada, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Hrvatski humanizam: pitanja terminologije i geografije" (Croatian humanism: questions of terminology and geography). *Dani Hvarskog kazališta: Janus Panonius*, vol. 16 (1990): pp. 5-13.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Krbavska katastrofa 1493 i rađanje hrvatske proze" (Catastrophe at Krbava and the birth of Croatian literature). In *Zrcalo Duhovno (književne studije)*, pp. 7-12. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Polilingvizam u hrvatskoj književnosti" (Poli-lingualism in Croatian Literature). In *Zrcalo duhovno (književne studije)*, pp. 167-180. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, 1997.

Borchardt, Frank L. *German antiquity in Renaissance Myth*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.

Brogi-Bercoff, Giovanna. "Il Priboevo et il 'Regno degli Slavi' di Mauro Orbini." *Rievolvere slavistiche*, no. 22-23 (1975-1976): pp. 137-154.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Il Regno degli Slavi di Mauro Orbini e la storiographia europea del Cinquecento." *Rievolvere slavistiche*, no. 24-26 (1977-1979): pp. 119-156.

Bracewell, Catherin W. *The Uskoks of Senj. Piracy, Banditry and Holy War in the Sixteenth-Century Adriatic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Burke, Peter. *The Renaissance Sense of the Past*. New York: St. Martin Press, 1969.

Cochrane, Eric. *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Cvjetin, Dominko. *Traženje Hrvatske kroz Ilirsku priču* (In search of Croatia through the Illyrian story). Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1942.

Ćirković, Sima. "Mauro Orbini: His Life and Work." In Orbini Mauro, *Il regno degli Slavi*, pp. 7-23. Munchen: Verlag Otto Sagner, 1985.

Čoralić, Lovorka. "Jedno novo saznanje o Vinku Pribojeviću?" (Some new information about Vinko Pribojević?) *Croatia Christiana periodica*, no. 42 (1998): pp. 253-255.

Črne, Zvane. *Kulturna historija Hrvatske* (Cultural history of Croatia). Zagreb, 1969.

Đurđev, Branko, Grafenauer Boris, and Tadić Jorjo, eds. *Historija Naroda Jugoslavije* vol. 2. (History of the Peoples of Yugoslavia). Zagreb: 1959.

Fancev, Franjo. "Ilirstvo u hrvatskom narodnom preporodu" (Illyrianism in the Croatian National Revival). *Ljetopis JAZU*, vol. 49. (1937): pp. 130-157.

- Fiszman, Samuel. ed. *The Polish Renaissance in its European Context*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Franičević, Marin. *Povijest hrvatske renesansne književnosti* (History of the Croatian Renaissance Literature). vols 1-2 Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1986.
- Friedrich, Karin. *The Other Prussia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Geary, Patrick. *Myths of the Nations*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Gellner, Ernest. *Nacije i nacionalizmi (Nations and Nationalisms)*. Zagreb: Politička kultura, 1998.
- Gortan, Veljko. "Juraj Šižgorić i Vinko Pribojević." (Juraj Šižgorić and Vinko Pribojević). *Filologija*, vol. 2 (1960): pp. 149-152.
- Gortan, Veljko and Vratović Vladimir. "Temeljne značajke hrvatskog latinizma" (Fundamental features of Croatian Latinity). *Forum*, no. 8 (1969): pp. 606-636.
- Hale, John. *The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance*. London: Fontana Press, 1993.
- Hampton, Timothy. *Literature and Nation in the Sixteenth Century. Inventing Renaissance France*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Writing from history: the rhetoric of exemplarity in Renaissance literature*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Eduard Hercigonja, *Tropismena i trojezična kultura hrvatskog srednjovjekovlja* (Three alphabet - three language Culture of the Croatian Middle Ages). Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1994.
- Hutchinson, John and Smith, Anthony. eds. *Ethnicity*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Katančić, Frano. "Dubrovnik u razvitku hrvatske književnosti" (Role of the Dubrovnik in the Development of Croatian Literature). *Ljetopis JAZU*, vol. 52 (1940): pp. 104-139.
- Katičić, Radoslav. "Ilirci i ilirski jezik" (The Illyrians and the Illyrian Language). *Forum*, no. 56 (1988): pp. 675-688.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "LITRARUM STUDIA. Latinska pismenost i književna naobrazba u Hrvatskoj IX. stoljeća" (LITRARUM STUDIA. Latin literacy and literary

- education in IX<sup>th</sup> century Croatia). *Forum*, no. 57 (1989): pp. 5-12.
- Kelley, Donald R. *Foundations of modern historical scholarship : language, law, and history in the French Renaissance*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.
- Klaić, Nada. *Povijest Hrvata u Srednjem vijeku* (History of Croats in the Middle Ages). Zagreb: Globus, 1990.
- Nikica Kolumbić, "Humanistička naobrazba u hrvatskih renesansnih pjesnika (Humanistic education of Croatian Renaissance poets)" *Dani hvarskog kazališta: Hrvatski humanizam - Ianus Panonius*, vol. 16 (1990): pp. 56-71.
- Kombol, Mihovil. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti do preporoda* (History of the Croatian Literature Before the National Revival). Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1961.
- Kovač, Joško. "O podrijetlu Vicka Pribojevića." (Concerning the Origins of Vinko Pribojević) *Croatica Christiana periodica*, no. 42 (1998): pp. 207-209.
- Krasić, Stjepan. "Generalno učilište dominikanskog reda u Zadru ili Universitas Jadertina 1396-1807 " (*Gtudium Generale* of Dominican Order in Zadar or Universitas Jadertina 1396-1807 ) Zadar: Filozofski fakultet, 1996.
- Kuntić-Makvić, Bruna. "O povijesti uporabe ilirskog nazivlja" (On the History of the Usage of the Illyrian Name). in *Spomenica Ljube Bobana*, pp. 133 – 143. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tradicija o našim krajevima u antičkom razdoblju kod dalmatinskih pisaca XVI i XVII stoljeća" (Tradition of Our Regions in Antiquity in the Works of Dalmatian Writers of 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> Century). *Živa antika*, no. 34 (1984): pp.155-164.
- Kurelac, Miroslav. "Pribojević Vinko (Vincentius Pribevo, Priboevius, XV/XVI st.)" In *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, vol. 6 Zagreb: 1965. p. 613.
- LaCapra, Dominic. *Rethinking Intellectual History: Text, Context, Language*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
- Morović, Hrvoje. "Legenda o povelji Aleksandra Velikoga u korist Slavena (Legend about privilege of Alexander the Great to the Slavs)." In *Sa stranica starih knjiga*, pp. 109-124. Split: Matica Hrvatska, 1968.
- Novak, Grga. "Dalmacija i Hvar u pribojevićevo doba (Dalmatia and Hvar In the Time of Vinko Pribojević)." In *Govor fra Vinka Pribojevića*, pp. 9-43. Zagreb: Književni Krug, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Hvar, Beograd: 1924.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Prošlost Dalmacije (The Dalmatian Past)*. Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2001.
- Novak, Slobodan P. *Povijest hrvatske književnosti, Od humanističkih početaka do Kašićeve ilirske gramatike iz 1604.* (History of Croatian Literature), vol. 2. Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus, 1997.
- Eduard Peričić, *Sclavorum regnum Grgura Barskog*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1991.
- Peti-Stanić, Anita. "Vinko Pribojević: De origine successibusque Slavorum." *Dani hvarskog kazališta: Hrvatski humanizam – Dubrovnik i Dalmatinske komune*, vol. 17 (1991): pp. 251-260.
- Pohl, Walter and Reimitz Helmut, eds. *Strategies of Distinction. The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.
- Porter, Roy, and Mikuláš Teich, eds. *The Renaissance in national context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Kruno Prijatelj, "Likovni umjetnici 'Schiavoni' iz Dalmacije u 15. stoljeću" (Visual Artists 'Schiavoni' from Dalmatia in 15<sup>th</sup> century). *Dani hvarskog kazališta: Hrvatski humanizam – Dubrovnik i Dalmatinske komune*, vol. 17 (1991): pp. 260-269.
- Rabil, Albert Jr., ed. *Renaissance Humanism, Foundations, Forms and Legacy*. vol. 2, Humanism beyond Italy. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.
- Rapacka Joana, "O nekim problemima iz povijesti odnosa hrvatskih humanista s Poljskom i Poljacima (Concernig some problems from history of relations between Croatian humanists and Poland and Poles)" *Dani hvarskog kazališta, Hrvatski humanizam – Janus Panonius*, vol. 16 (1990): pp. 168 – 175.
- Raukar, Tomislav. *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje* (Croatian Middle Ages). Zagreb: Školska Knjiga, 1997.
- Schellhase, Kenneth C. *Tacitus in Renaissance Political Thought*, Chicago and New York: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Schmaus, Alois. "Vincentius Priboevius, ein Vorläufer des Panslavismus." In *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* vol. 3 Munchen: 1953. pp. 243-254.
- Segel, Harold B. *Renaissance Culture in Poland: The Rise of Humanism (1470-1543)*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. New York: Blackwell, 1988.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Myths and memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Franjo Šanjek, "Ivan Stojković i počeci humanizma u Hrvata" (Ivan Stojković and beginnings of the Humanism among the Croats). *Dani hvarskog kazališta: Hrvatski humanizam - Ianus Panonius*, vol. 16 (1990): pp. 272-285.
- Šišić, Ferdo. "Hrvatska historiografija of XVI. do XX. Stoljeća" (Croatian historiography from XVI to XX century). *Jugoslavenski istoriski časopis*, no. I (1935): pp. 40-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ideja slavenske pradomovine u Podunavlju. Biologija priče o Čehu, Lehu i Mehu." (The Idea of Slavic Homeland in Transdanubia. Biology of the Story of Čeh, Leh and Meh). *Godišnjica Nikole Čupića*, no. 35. (1935): pp. 33-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Povijest Hrvata u Doba Narodnih Vladara* (History of Croats in the Age of Popular Rulers). Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1990.
- Toploski, Jerzy. "Myths In Research Into The Past." *Acta Polonie Historica*, vol. 81. (2000): p.6.
- Tully, James. ed. *Meaning and Context. Quentin Skinner and his Critics*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.
- Zlatar, Zdenko. *Between the Double Eagle and the Crescent*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Our Kingdome Come, The Counter-Reformation, the Republic of Dubrovnik, and the Liberation of the Balkan Slavs*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.